mirror of trinity

KAUSAR NIAZI

MIRROR OF TRINITY

MIRROR OF TRINITY

KAUSAR NIAZI

★

SH. MUHAMMAD ASHRAF
KASHMIRI BAZAR LAHORE (PAKISTAN)

First Edition, December 1975

PRINTED AT ASHRAF PRESS, LAHORE, AND
PUBLISHED BY SH. MUHAMMAD ASHRAF,
KASHMIRI BAZAR, LAHORE (PAKISTAN)

PREFACE

A'inah-i-Taslis of which this book, *Mirror of Trinity*, is a translation, was written by me some years ago. It should not be taken as a book of theoretical discussions or of a comparative study of religions. It should not be given more importance than that it sums up the studies of a student of religions.

I do not belong to that school of thought which consider that the comparative study and observation of the religions of the world is the be-all and the end-all of life. In my opinion, just as all the beauties of this universe owe their being to a natural variety, similarly the intellectual activities of man owe their existence to individual thought. Just as it is not necessary that the descendants of the same parents should be identically similar in their facial expressions, similarly human thought cannot be identical in its products, although it flows from the same source I think the variety of human thought and its conflicts are as great a gift of Nature as any other gift

But the condition is that these differences and conflicts (of human thought) should not be used to promote disorder and disturb the peace of the world. There is no harm if, side by side with the mosques,

the churches also hum with activity, but neither the visitors of the churches should conflict with those of the mosques nor the worshippers in the mosque should clash with the devotees of the church.

Islam, which is proud of its perfection, of its truth and of its world value, established a tradition of giving by its side a place to the church so that only a hair's breadth divided the church and the mosque and this it did, not when it was weak and politically subjugated, but at a time when its ascendancy was well recognised on all hands.

This is not a mere supposition or a claim which lacks historical basis. It is a reality as solid and weighty as the Himalayas. This reality was observed by the eyes of history not for one year or for a few hundred weeks, but continuously for seventy-five years in the same way as you see the fingers of a hand joined together.[1]

According to historians al-Mada'ini, al-Tabari, al-Baladhuri, Ibn Kathir, Ibn Athir and Ibn Khaldun,[2] when the Islamic army conquered half of Damascus by force and occupied the other half of Damascus by peaceful negotiations, the Muslim army came together from two sides at a place where was situated the famous church of St. John. This church

1. Ibn Asakir, *Tarikh*, Vol. I, p. 213; Ibn Kathir, Vol. IX, p. 142.

2. Tabari, 224-310 H.; Baladhuri, 892 H.; Ibn Athir, 544-606 H., Ibn Khaldun, 732-808 H.

of St. John was considered the holiest church of the Syriac world since the third century of the Christian era, until Khalid b. Walid lay conquest and Abu Ubaidah, by means of peaceful negotiations, took their armies by the side of this famous church, which was respected by the people of Syria as they respected God's throne and which even the rulers of Rome regarded as having equal sanctity with the greatest churches of Rome.

Any other conqueror, even if he were a Christian, would not have held the reins of his horse when he reached the precincts of the church of St John. He would have marched inside the church and his armies would have trampled the stones of the church, as if asking them to do obeisance. But Khalid was the representative of a religion which was the most tolerant of all the religions of the world. He held the reins of his horse, got down and asked his companions to advise him.

History has acknowledged that when this situation arose, those people who were acquainted with the history of Damascus related to him all the details about the history of the church of St. John.

They told Khalid that at this site was situated a Greek temple whose sanctity was vouched for by the Greek gods themselves. But when Constantine ascended the throne and his zeal for the preaching of Christianity assumed the form of a madness, he broke down

this temple and baptised it as the church of St. John.[3]

This was a story which furnished an historical precedent to Khalid b. Walid who could, if he liked, convert this church to Islam, but he did not believe in such historical precedents.

He had with him the instructions of Abu Bakr: "If they fight against you, you have the right to fight them, if they take up the sword against you, you can also unsheathe your swords, but if they make peace with you, you will have to give them security of life and property."[4]

Here the situation was complex. Half the city had fought him, drawn the sword against him and left no stone unturned to defend itself.

But the people of the other half of the city had hastened to make peace, and had asked for security from Abu Ubaidah who was posted at the western gate of the city Afraid of the fierce attacks of Khalid b. Walid they had thrown away their weapons.

Every soldier of the army of Khalid insisted that they had conquered the city of Damascus by force and those who had made peace with Abu Ubaidah had done so out of weakness and incapacity to fight. Therefore, the whole city should be treated as if it had been conquered by force and the church of

3 Ibn Asakir, op. cit., Vol. I, p 213; Ibn Kathir, Vol. IX, p. 142.
4 Ibn Asakir, op. cit., Vol. I. 499-571 B.

St. John should be turned into a mosque.

But following the standard of justice laid down by the Holy Prophet of Islam, Khalid b Walid divided the church of St John into two equal parts. Ibn Asakir and Ibn Kathir narrate that the eastern part of the church was declared to have been conquered by force and belonged to the Muslims who used it as a mosque, while the western part which was treated as having been occupied by peaceful negotiations remained a place of worship for the Christians.[5] This continued to be the situation for seventy-five years until Walid, the Umayyad Caliph, entered into a new treaty with the Christians

Both Muslims and Christians visited the church for such a long period and worshipped God in their own ways [6]

Not only in Damascus, we extended the same toleration in Cordova and used the largest church of Cordova half as a mosque and half as a church, despite the fact that we were conquerors of Cordova.[7]

I do not claim that world peace cannot be promoted without repeating the tradition that half of a building should be used as a mosque and the other

5. Ibn Kathir, Vol. IX, p. 143; al-Suyuti, *Husn al-Muhasir*, p. 407; Ibn Jubair, p. 262

6. Ibn Shakir, Vol. II, p. 413, al-Suyuti, op. cit., p. 407.

7. *Al-Bayan al-Maghrib*, Vol. II, p. 19; Maqri, p. 255.

half as a church. To promote and extend world peace mankind has found many new ways. These ways can also be tried and tested provided the modern man realises that the mosque and the church were meant to promote the feeling of respect for humanity. They were not meant to injure one another's feelings or to do injustice to one another.

In reality, that church is not a church in the true sense of the word which fails to promote respect for humanity, nor is that mosque a real mosque which embellishes itself with the blood of humanity. The true church is that which waters the tree of humanity as the real mosque is that which brings peace and comfort to humanity.

In my opinion, every church has the right to blow its own trumpet, while the mosque is also free to sing its paeans of triumph, provided both the church and the mosque observe the limits laid down by humanity.

Of course, the mosque and the church can compete with each other, but here also the condition is that they do not hurt each other's feelings.

This book has been written with the same spirit. The need arose, because the churchmen in Pakistan have, for the last twenty-five years, adopted a style of preaching their religion which is against all canons of justice.

Preface

In have tried in this book to unveil a few truths about Christianity in order to hold up the mirror only to those churchmen who disregard the rights of the mosque in their zeal for proselytisation and, on the pretext of bringing salvation to humanity, are guilty of uttering such misstatements as violate the basic values of humanity. As a result, simple and ignorant people are plunged in a darkness which admits of no light.

I have no intention to injure the feelings of the peaceful Christian inhabitants of Pakistan. They deserve every respect and regard and they have every right to improve their lot, within the limits of their religion, like the Muslim citizens of Pakistan.

KAUSAR NIAZI

449 Margla Hills
Islamabad

CONTENTS

Chapter 1

GENEALOGY

When writing the biography of a great hero, it is necessary for the historian to say something about his descent. Take the biographers of the Holy Prophet of Islam. They have generally divided his genealogy into two parts. The first part extends from the Holy Prophet till Adnan Adnan's name comes twenty-second among the ancestors of the Holy Prophet. About this part of his genealogy, all the biographers are agreed. *Kitab al-Isti'ab* says: "Not one of the biographers disagrees on this."[1] The second part of the genealogy begins with Adnan and extends up to Ishmael. About this part, there is disagreement among his biographers. Ibn Ishaq[2] and Ibn Jarir and, according to one tradition, Imam Sakhawi, permit its description, while some other scholars consider it to be disapproved. However, some scholars have taken great pains and undertaken a vast amount of research in completing the Holy Prophet's genealogy up to the Prophet Ishmael. This much is agreed that the names of and the events relating to twenty-two ancestors of the Holy

1. *Isti'ab*, Vol I.

2. Ibn Ishaq, d. 150 H.

Prophet are preserved in history.

On the contrary, when we try to study the genealogy of Jesus Christ in the New Testament, we have to meet with sore disappointment. Mark and John do not think it necessary at all to mention his genealogy. Matthew and Luke have tried to perform this duty which they owed to themselves as historians and it is clear that it was not difficult for them to mention a few ancestors of Christ and relate some important events about them. But we are sorry to note that they have confined themselves to writing down a few names. They say nothing about those persons. The title of the genealogy proposed by Matthew is as follows: "The book of the generation of Jesus Christ, the son of David, the son of Abraham."

There are twenty-six ancestors between Christ and David and twelve ancestors between David and Abraham, but Matthew does not care even to mention them.

The genealogy ends in the following words of Matthew: "And Jacob begot Joseph, the husband of Mary, of whom was born Jesus."

According to Matthew, Joseph was the name of the husband of Mary, but he admits that Jesus Christ was the son of Mary, but not of Joseph. Now, it is quite clear that if Christ be the son of Joseph, then this genealogy is really his own. It was to be

admitted on this supposition that Joseph is a descendant of David and, because Christ was the son of Joseph, he is also descended from David. But even Matthew and his supporters admit that Christ was not the son of Joseph but of Mary. It is, therefore, beyond one's understanding why the genealogy of Joseph is treated as the genealogy of Christ. If Matthew had to write the genealogy of Christ, he should have begun with Jesus, the son of Mary, and then written down the genealogy of Mary.

This was Matthew's masterpiece! Now let us come to the genealogy written by Luke.

Luke in his Gospel in chapter iii, verses 23-38, has said:

"And Jesus himself began to be thirty years of age, being (as was supposed) the son of Joseph, which was the son of Heli."

The basic mistake committed by Matthew is also present here. The only difference is that, according to Matthew, the grandfather of Jesus Christ was Jacob, while, according to Luke, his grandfather was Heli. One of these two names is certainly wrong. There are two writers on genealogy but both disagree even on the name of the grandfather of Christ.

You have seen the efforts made by those who hold that Jesus is the son of God Now look at the industriousness of those who, according to the Christians, deny the greatness of Christ.

Muslim scholars have traced the genealogy of Christ through Mary. Although, lacking precise information, they differ with regard to names, one thing is recognised as authentic by all of them, namely, that Mary's mother Hannah and her father Imran are descended from Solomon.

Ibn Ishaq traces the genealogy of Imran in the following manner:

"Imran, son of Yashim, son of Mitha, son of Jizqiah, son of Abraham, son of Azria, son of Norish, son of Ajr, son of Yahwa, son of Nazim, son of Mutassit, son of Esha, son of Ayaz, son of Rakhyem, son of Solomon, son of David.

BIRTH OF CHRIST

The birth of Jesus Christ is an incident of great significance for the Christians. It is on the basis of this incident that the Christians claim that Christ was the son of God. Therefore, in view of the delicate nature of this subject we shall deal with it in some detail. In this connection we will also discuss the question whether Jesus was actually the son of God or the Biblical statement of Jesus being the son of God refers to some different matter. Both the Qur'an and the different versions of the New Testament have described the birth of Jesus Christ in their peculiar styles. Let us first take the details given by the Qur'an. In the chapter entitled "Mary," it is said:

"Relate in the Book (the story of) Mary, when she withdrew from her family to a place in the East. She placed a screen (to screen herself) from them; then We sent to her Our angel, and he appeared before her as a man in all respects. She said: 'I seek refuge from thee to (God) Most Gracious: (come not near) if thou dost fear God.' He said: 'Nay, I am only a messenger from thy Lord (to announce) to thee the gift of a holy son. She said:

'How shall I have a son, seeing that no man has touched me and I am not unchaste?' He said: 'So (it will be): thy Lord saith, "That is easy for Me: and (We wish) to appoint him as a Sign unto men and a Mercy from Us": it is a matter so decreed.' So she conceived him, and she retired with him to a remote place" (xix. 16-22).

God created Jesus Christ without any father to make him a special sign. When the angel gave the glad tidings of the birth of Christ to Mary, she cried: "How is it possible? I am not married and I am chaste. How can I have a son?" The angel said: "This is not difficult for God. When He commands something to be, He says 'Be' and it is."

The Christians have developed strange beliefs about Jesus Christ in view of his unusual birth, but the Qur'an has made the point clear by saying:

"The similitude of Jesus before God is that of Adam; He created him from dust, then said to him, 'Be' and he was" (iii. 59).

What the Qur'an means is this: that if you hold that to be born fatherless makes one the son of God, what have you to say about Adam who was both fatherless and motherless? When, in spite of this, you do not treat Adam as God, but as the first man, how is it that you treat Christ as the son of God, when his birth was not so strange as that of Adam? When we study the history of Greeks, we find that even the superstitious people among them

used to treat many of their gods and other famous men as the sons of God. This belief was based on the idea that they were born fatherless. It seems that the Christians, under the influence of the Greeks, adopted this belief, but they forgot that the claim made about some persons to have been born fatherless, like Jesus, bears testimony to the fact that God can, whenever He likes, create a man who has no father. Such incidents are unusual, no doubt, but they are not impossible.

1. Draper[1] in his book, *Conflict Between Religion and Science*, says about Plato that he was born at Athens 429 years before Christ. His mother Paraction was betrothed to Arus but, before they could come together, Paraction conceived of Apollo, who was the Holy Ghost of the Greek Pantheon. This god (Apollo) appeared in a dream to Arus and threatened him saying: "Your fiancee has conceived of me. Therefore, do not go near her, because you must honour the Holy Ghost." This is the reason why the Egyptian disciples of Plato believed that he is the son of God. It is an historical fact worth consideration that the spread of Christianity owes much to Constantine,[2] who believed that Apollo was the sun-god. He also firmly held and zealously preached that this sun-god was the father of Plato.

1. Draper, 1811-1882. Plato, d. 227 B. C.
2. Constantine, A.D. 272-337.

When Constantine was converted to Christianity, he not only made Christianity the state religion of his domains but also made special efforts to propagate the doctrine that Jesus Christ was the son of God.

2. According to the belief of the Romans and the Greeks, Hercules was not the son of any human being. He was born through the agency of Zeus who is regarded as being the vicegerent of the Holy Ghost.

3. A similar incident relates to the god Bacchus, famous among the Greeks. His mother Semele was the daughter of the ruler of Thebes. The god Platour injected his own spirit in Semele, as a result of which god Bacchus came into being. The Greek intellectuals and philosophers hold that god Bacchus is the god of wine. It is for this reason that Bacchanalian is the name given in English to top drunkards.

4. Draper also says that De Scovia, the mother of Romulus, the founder of Rome, was a virgin when she begot a son through the grace of God or through the power of the Holy Ghost and Rome was named after her son.

5. The famous Western historian, Gibbon,[3] in his book, *The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*,

3. Gibbon A.D. 1734-1794.

and Draper in his above-mentioned work say that Alexander had married a daughter of Darius. The Greeks believed that the mother of this daughter of Darius was born of the Holy Ghost.

6. Pythagoras was born 575 years before Christ. The Greeks believed about him too that he was born without a father and that he was the son of God.

It is not our purpose to enumerate all such historical incidents. What we want to show is that history gives us a long list of children born without a father. This also proves that just as the superstitious people among the Greeks, when they saw some of their ancestors being born of virgin mothers, declared them to be sons of God, similarly the Christians also declared that Christ was the son of God.

This, of course, relates to our ancestors. Even in our own times incidents occur which cannot be understood by reason. We can only say that they are extraordinary events brought about by Nature. All the noted English newspapers in Pakistan have recently published a news with reference to an English medical weekly journal, *The Lancet*, published in England, according to which an unmarried girl gave birth to a child. She claimed that no man had ever touched her. A team of doctors reviewed her case. They adopted all possible scientific devices

4. Pythagoras d, 570 B C.

and came to the conclusion that they could not legitimately contradict her claims. The news is reported thus:

"London: June 29 [1956]. The weekly professional medical journal, *The Lancet*, published details on Friday of the first indisputable case of parthenogensis or virgin birth in Britain. The review published the case of a young woman whose name was not revealed, who claimed her daughter was the result of a virgin birth. A team of doctors studied the case and . . . 'after applying every known scientific test the doctors were unable to contradict the mother's claims. One test revealed the bloods of mother and daughter were identical The organic build up of the mother was also the same as that of the daughter in every detail,' said *The Lancet*" (APP).

These things show that it is not difficult for God to bring forth in the world someone without a father. He created many angels without a father. Adam was created in the same way and Eve also came into being similarly. Innumerable worms are created in the same way. Therefore, if God sent a Prophet into this world without a father in order to make a sign of Him, why should we feel astonished? Why should he be declared the son of God on this basis? The main reason why the Christians were misled was that Jesus Christ was born in a strange way. From here, they strayed and began to claim that Christ was the son of God. Luke says in the

first chapter, verses 26-36, of his Gospel of the New Testament:

"And in the sixth month the angel Gabriel was sent from God unto a city of Galilee, named Nazareth, to a virgin espoused to a man whose name was Joseph, of the house of David; and the virgin's name was Mary. And the angel came in unto her and said: Hail *thou that art* highly favoured. The Lord *is* with thee; blessed art thou among women. And when she saw him she was troubled at his saying, and cast in her mind what manner of salutation this should be. And the angel said unto her, Fear not, Mary: for thou hast found favour with God. And, behold, thou shalt conceive in thy womb, and bring forth a son, and shalt call his name Jesus. He shall be great, and shall be called the Son of the Highest: and the Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David: and he shall reign over the house of Jacob for ever, and of his kingdom there shall be no end. Then said Mary unto the angel, How shall this be, seeing that I know not a man? And the angel answered and said unto her, The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee: therefore, also that holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the son of God."

This statement shows that:

1. Gabriel went to Mary in Nazareth. The statement does not show where Mary stayed at that time: in her house or in the temple?

2. The angel saluted her, spoke to her and said: Thou hast found favour with God.

3. Hearing this Mary fell into deep thought. (How Luke came to know of her state of mind is not clear.) She was troubled, fell to pondering and was afraid.

4. The angel explained the term "favour" by saying that Mary will conceive, and bring forth a child. The angel directed her to name the child as Jesus.

5. He will be great. God will give him the throne of David. He will eternally reign over the house of Jacob. (It is clear that this promise was not fulfilled. He did not receive even a temporary kingdom.)

6. About the son the angel said that the Holy Ghost will descend on Mary (thus Gabriel is not the Holy Ghost). He will descend. God's power will overshadow her. She will bring forth a son. He will be called the son of God. Let the readers note that all these sentences are disconnected with each other.

7. Mary is modest and conscious. She had been espoused to Joseph. It is clear, therefore, that she knows a man and yet she says to Gabriel: "How shall this be, seeing that I know not a man?"

She spoke these words out of modesty. Even a man with ordinary common sense can understand that this was a natural question. Gabriel should have answered this question in a way which should

have satisfied her. But what was the reply: "The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee." The question is whether Gabriel himself had not descended on her. Then what is the connection between saying that the "spirit of God will overshadow thee" and saying that she will bring forth a child. Human reason cannot admit that God did not teach Gabriel the answer to this natural question of Mary. It seems that Luke has forgotten something here. Even Christ himself did not explain this. He said: The spirit of truth will answer this question. Wait for him who will answer (this question).

If a favourable construction is put on this matter, a certain meaning can be assigned to these words. The general style of the Bible is such that it uses the phrase "son of God" for the virtuous people and "father" for God. Innumerable passages can be quoted from the Bible where the phrase "son of God" has been used in this metaphorical sense. If the phrase is understood in a literal sense, it will provoke laughter. Here a few excerpts are given:

1. Matthew in his chapter v, verse 9, says: "Blessed are the peacemakers: for they shall be called the children of God." If the phrase "the children of God" deceives any of our Christian friends into taking someone as the real son of God, a great difficulty shall arise. Every peacemaker will become the son of God and God will have a large

army of sons will-nilly.

2. Christ says: " . . . and pray for them which despitefully use you, and persecute you; that ye may be the children of your Father which is in heaven" (Matthew, v, 44-45).

3. Christ directs: "And if ye salute your brethren only, what do ye more *than others*? . . . Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect" (Matthew, v, 48).

Thus Christ directed that one should salute all, because this is the way of the heavenly father. He is perfect. You should also be perfect. It is clear from this that it is possible to salute all persons. Therefore, it is possible to be perfect and he who is perfect is the son of the heavenly father.

4. In chapter ix, verses 2-7, it is said: ". . . they brought to him a man sick of the palsy, lying on a bed: and Jesus . . . said unto the sick of the palsy; Son, be of good cheer; thy sins be forgiven Thee. . . . And he arose, and departed to his house [in the state of health]."

According to Matthew, Jesus did this that the scribes knew that "the Son of man hath power on earth to forgive sins" (Matthew, ix, 6). It is clear that this sick man was not the son of Jesus. He used the word "son" out of love for him. Similarly, if the Bible uses the phrase "son of God" for someone, it is out of love and affection and not because

he is really the son of God.

5. Verses 25, 26, 27 of chapter xi may be seen. Jesus said : "I thank thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth, because thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent, and hast revealed it unto babes." If "babes" here is taken in a literal sense, it will prove that Christ was the child of God, all his disciples and devotees were also the children of God.

6. In chapter xxiii, verses 9, 10, 11, Christ says to his disciples: 'And call no *man* your father upon the earth : for one is your Father, which is in heaven."

It is clear that all the disciples of Christ are not real brothers. They are Christian brothers. Their relationship is not of this earth, but heavenly. It is not physical, but spiritual. They are told not to call any man father on this earth. The question arises whether they had not any physical father. They certainly had. This shows that God was their spiritual father and the same spiritual father is also the father of Christ.

7. St. John (i, 12-13) says in his Gospel: "But as many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God . . . which were born not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God."

These are clear and definite words. Christ is the

son of God because God is pleased with him, so much pleased that he who accepts him also becomes the son of God. He is born of God not of body or blood or the will of man. Can anybody say that Christ and his devotees are physically and racially, not spiritually, the sons of God.

8. According to St. John (viii, 37-42), talking to Jews, Jesus said to them : "I know that ye are Abraham's seed.... They answered and said unto him, Abraham is our father. Jesus saith unto them, If ye were Abraham's children, ye would do the works of Abraham. . . . Then said they unto him, We be not born of fornication ; we have one Father, *even* God. Jesus said unto them, If God were your Father, ye would love me."

Just consider these words. Christ says repeatedly that he who treads someone's footsteps is his son. He admits that the Jews are descended from Abraham. But even so, he says that if they had been the sons of Abraham, they would do the works of Abraham. Here also he has made works the main criterion for having been descended from someone. They said : Our father is God. Christ replied that if they were sons of God, they would love him. In other words, anyone who loves Christ is the son of God. Thus millions of people who love Christ are the sons of God.

9. A little later (John, viii, 44), Christ says to

them : "Ye are of *your* father the devil, and the lusts of your father ye will do."

It is clear that they were not racially the sons of the devil. He called them sons of the devil because of their wickedness. Moreover, he said : "He that is of God heareth God's words: ye therefore, hear *them* not, because ye are not of God" (John, viii, 47). In this way, John, Mark, Luke and Matthew are all sons of God, because they wrote the Gospels, and the Christians were able to hear the words of God due to their writings.

In short, father and son have been used in the Bible in a metaphorical sense. Son of God means a virtuous servant of God. It seems that the writers of Gospel have adopted this style from Torah, which uses the form "firstborn of God" for Israel (Exodus, iii, 22-23) and God has been declared to be the father of Israel (Jeremiah, xxxi). The same honour of being the firstborn of God has been extended by Torah to Ephraim (Jeremiah, xxxi). The writers of the Gospel must have followed this example in using the words father and son. But our Christian friends were misled by the use of these words and went to extremes.

We have recorded the events about the birth of Christ both from the Qur'an and the Bible. Now the readers should judge for themselves which version appeals to their common sense. We also referred to

ancient history and drew a list of fatherless children whom the superstitious people among the Greeks declared as having been the sons of God. They were imitated by the Christians who declared Christ to be the son of God. Now, there is only one deficiency. We have not quoted the Bible for the existence of any other fatherless child. Now, at the end of this discussion, let us make up for this deficiency also The Bible speaks of a fatherless and motherless child other than Adam If you question the Christians, they will not say that he is the son of God, although they will admit that he resembles Christ. If Christ is born fatherless, he becomes the son of God, but if any other person is born without a father and without a mother, he remains a mere human being. This is strange logic.

Paul in his Epistle to Hebrews (vii, 3) speaks of a pious person Melichisedec and says:

"Without father, without mother, without descent, having neither beginning of days, nor end of life; but made like unto the Son of God; abideth a priest continually."

Chapter 3

TEACHINGS OF CHRIST

When Jesus Christ was vested with prophethood by God, the moral and religious condition of the Israelites was far from being satisfactory. Polytheistic beliefs and practices had taken hold of them. They believed that Ezra was the son of God. Falsehood, hypocrisy and deceit had become part of their life. Their religious scholars were greedy of money. Trading in religion was a general phenomenon. It was a normal practice to render lawful what was unlawful and *vice versa*. They did not desist from killing their virtuous people for performing the duty of enjoining good and forbidding evil. These were the conditions when God sent Jesus Christ to gather the lost sheep of Israel.

What were the teachings of Jesus? It is not difficult for a Muslim to decide this in the presence of the Qur'an. According to the faith of a Muslim, all the Prophets from Adam to Muhammad preached the same religion of truth. Their systém of laws differed according to varying conditions of life, but the fundamental message was the same, namely, that people should worship one God, follow their

Prophet so that on the Day of Judgment they may not have to repent. This was the message propagated by Jesus Christ among his people. The Qur'an says:

"When Jesus came with clear signs, he said: 'Now have I come to you with Wisdom, and in order to make clear to you some of the (points) on which ye dispute: therefore, fear God and obey me" (xliii. 63).

Although in its present form the authority of the Bible cannot be relied upon, but even so, it supports the standpoint of the Qur'an as stated in the above verse. Let us test this claim by quoting a few references from the Bible. First of all we begin with the belief in the unity of God.

Unity of God

"Here, O Israel: The Lord our God *is* one Lord. And thou shalt love the lord thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy might" (Deuteronomy, vi, 4-5).

"Among the gods *there is* none like unto thee: O Lord; neither *are there any works* like unto thy works.

"All nations whom thou hast made shall come and worship before Thee, O Lord; and shall glorify thy name.

"For thou *art* great and doest wonderful things: thou *art* God alone" (Psalms, lxxxvi, 8-10).

"And one of the scribes came, and having heard them reasoning together, and perceiving that he had answered them well, asked him, Which is the first commandment of all?

"And Jesus answered him, The first of all commandments *is*, Hear O Israel; The Lord our God is one Lord:

"And thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and with all thy strength: this *is* the first commandment.

"And the second *is* like, *namely* this, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself. There is none other commandment greater than these.

"And the scribe said unto him, Well, Master, thou hast said the truth: for there is one God; and there is none other but He" (St. Mark, xii, 28-32).

Faith in the Hereafter

The *Yaum al-Din* (Day of Retribution) called by the Qur'an has been described here as the Day of Judgment.

"Be ye afraid of the sword: for wrath *bringeth* the punishment of the sword, that ye may know *there is* a judgment" (Job, xix, 29).

"But the Lord shall endure for ever: he hath prepared his throne for judgment.

"And he shall judge the world in righteousness, he shall minister judgment to the people in uprightness" (Psalms, ix, 7-8).

"The righteous shall rejoice when he seeth the vengeance: he shall wash his feet in the blood of the wicked.

"So that a man shall say, Verily *there is* a reward for the righteous: verily he is a God that judgeth in the earth" (Psalms, lviii, 10-11).

"And at that time shall Michael stand up, the great prince which standeth for the children of thy people : and there shall be a time of trouble, such as never was since there was a nation *even* to that same time: and that time thy people shall be delivered, every one that shall be found written in the book.

"And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame *and* everlasting contempt.

"And they that be wise shall shine as the brightness of the firmament; and they that turn many to righteousness as the stars for ever and ever" (xii, 1-3).

"And I will come near to you to judgment; and I will be a swift witness against the sorcerers, and against the adulterers, and against false swearers and against those that oppress the hireling in *his* wages, the widow, and the fatherless, and that turn aside the stranger *from his right*, and fear not me, saith the Lord of hosts" (Malachi, iii, 5).

" . . . for we shall stand before the judgment seat of Christ" (Romans, xiv, 10).

"So then every one of us shall give account of himself to God" (Romans, xiv, 12).

Everyone who is not prejudiced can see that the fundamental tenets of Christ and other Prophets (in

spite of the vagueness created by the Gospel-writers) closely correspond with the basic beliefs of Islam. It seems as if they are two tunes arising from the same musical instrument and two pictures drawn up by the same artist. The Qur'an has uttered the truth when it says: "Mankind were one single nation," and "But the People of the Book, after the clear Signs came to them, did not differ except through selfish contumacy" (ii. 213).

Some Prohibitions

Adultery

"Ye have heard that it was said by them of old time, Thou shalt not commit adultery:

"But I say unto you, that whosoever looketh on a woman to lust after her hath committed adultery with her already in his heart.

"And if thy right eye offend thee, pluck it out, and cast *it* from thee: for it is profitable for thee that one of thy members should perish, and not *that* thy whole body should be cast into hell" (Matthew, v, 27-29).

Prohibition against Amassing Wealth

"Now when Jesus heard these things, he said unto him, Yet lackest thou one thing: sell all that thou hast, and distribute unto the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven: and come, follow me.

"And when he heard this, he was very sorrowful; for he was very rich.

"And when Jesus saw that he was very sorrowful, he said: How hardly they that have riches shall enter into the kingdom of God!

"For it is easier for a camel to go through a needle's eye, than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of God" (Luke, xviii, 22-25).

About Dancing and Adultery

"Let us walk honestly, as in the day; not in rioting and drunkenness, not in chambering and wantonness, not in strife and envying" (Paul's Epistle to the Romans, xiii, 13).

Flesh and Wine

"*It is* good neither to eat flesh, nor to drink wine, nor *any thing* whereby thy brother stumbleth . . . " (Romans, xiv, 21).

Commandments about Women

"In like manner also, that women adorn themselves in modest apparel, with shamefacedness and sobriety; not with broided hair, or gold, or pearls, or costly array.

"But (which becometh women professing godliness) with good works.

"Let the women learn in silence with all subjection" (First Epistle of Paul to Timothy, ii, 9-11).

It is not intended to quote long excerpts. These few examples are enough to give an idea to the unprejudiced Christians as to how mercilessly these

teachings of Christ are being trampled under foot in their society. Not only this, the Christian society is actually proud of its ways which are a flagrant violation of the teachings of their master. Not content wiih this, the Christians are trying to change the social set-up of the Muslims so that they may accept those filthy and profane ways of social living which are contrary to the above commandments.

Chapter 4

MIRACLES OF JESUS CHRIST

It is the established *Sunnah* (practice) of God that He gives every Prophet the power to work miracles in order to clinch the argument against his opponents. Miracle is something which it is impossible for any person other than a Prophet to perform. It is an extraordinary happening which is supernormal and which creates a belief in the human mind that such a happening could come to pass only with Divine support and the like of which cannot be brought to pass by any human agency. There are some people who are gifted with sanity and clarity of vision. For them the very life of the Prophet constitutes a miracle. His voice and his face inspire credibility in his mission. Abdullah b. Salam was a Jewish scholar. When he heard of the advent of the Last Prophet (Muhammad), he asked for no proof. He merely asked his friends to take him to the Prophet. He cast a glance at the Prophet (Muhammad) and spontaneously cried out: "This face cannot be the face of a liar." But such people have always remained a tiny minority. The majority consists of those who test the claim to prophethood by

asking for some clear evidence of Divine support. To satisfy this majority in full, the Prophets have been given the power to perform miracles.

If one ponders over the miracles performed by the Prophets, a general rule emerges, and it is that the power to perform miracles was given by God according to the needs and circumstances of the time. For example, during the time of Moses, the art of magic had become very popular. God gave Moses the power to perform a miracle which eclipsed the art of the Egyptian sorcerers, and they had no alternative except to believe in the God of Moses. The period in which our Prophet (Muhammad) lived was noted for its art of eloquent speech. Every Arab was proud of his language and his command over it, until they declared that all other nations are dumb by comparison with them. God gave him the grand miracle of the Holy Qur'an to suit the requirements of the time. Even the greatest of speakers and poets have been and are unable to produce a chapter like one of the chapters of the Qur'an. This miracle stands as prominent today as in the past, and it will continue to defy human ingenuity till the end of time. Similarly, during the time of Jesus Christ, the science of medicine was at its highest. Many medical doctors were displaying their feats in this sphere. God Almighty gave Jesus Christ such great healing powers that the

Chapter 4

MIRACLES OF JESUS CHRIST

It is the established *Sunnah* (practice) of God that He gives every Prophet the power to work miracles in order to clinch the argument against his opponents. Miracle is something which it is impossible for any person other than a Prophet to perform. It is an extraordinary happening which is supernormal and which creates a belief in the human mind that such a happening could come to pass only with Divine support and the like of which cannot be brought to pass by any human agency. There are some people who are gifted with sanity and clarity of vision. For them the very life of the Prophet constitutes a miracle. His voice and his face inspire credibility in his mission. Abdullah b. Salam was a Jewish scholar. When he heard of the advent of the Last Prophet (Muhammad), he asked for no proof. He merely asked his friends to take him to the Prophet. He cast a glance at the Prophet (Muhammad) and spontaneously cried out: "This face cannot be the face of a liar." But such people have always remained a tiny minority. The majority consists of those who test the claim to prophethood by

asking for some clear evidence of Divine support. To satisfy this majority in full, the Prophets have been given the power to perform miracles.

If one ponders over the miracles performed by the Prophets, a general rule emerges, and it is that the power to perform miracles was given by God according to the needs and circumstances of the time. For example, during the time of Moses, the art of magic had become very popular. God gave Moses the power to perform a miracle which eclipsed the art of the Egyptian sorcerers, and they had no alternative except to believe in the God of Moses. The period in which our Prophet (Muhammad) lived was noted for its art of eloquent speech. Every Arab was proud of his language and his command over it, until they declared that all other nations are dumb by comparison with them. God gave him the grand miracle of the Holy Qur'an to suit the requirements of the time. Even the greatest of speakers and poets have been and are unable to produce a chapter like one of the chapters of the Qur'an. This miracle stands as prominent today as in the past, and it will continue to defy human ingenuity till the end of time. Similarly, during the time of Jesus Christ, the science of medicine was at its highest. Many medical doctors were displaying their feats in this sphere. God Almighty gave Jesus Christ such great healing powers that the

greatest of medical doctors were dumbfounded. Among these powers was the power to raise the dead and it is clear that this was his greatest miracle.

It is related from Abdullah b. Abbas in the book, *Ma'alim al-Tanzil* that Jesus Christ brought to life four dead persons:

1. Azar, a friend of Christ, who was brought out from his grave after he had been buried for three days.

2. The son of an old woman. His funeral was being taken to the graveyard but he alighted from the shoulders of the funeral-bearers and walked home.

3. The daughter of a tax-collector who had been lying dead in her house for one day.

4. Salim b. Nuh.

1. The first incident is related only by John in his Gospel. He was the brother of a woman who had laid ointment at the feet of Christ. According to John, this incident took place at a distance of two miles from Jerusalem. The news of the incident spread immediately. The strange thing is how this incident remained unknown to other writers of the Gospels.

2. The incident relating to the son of the old woman is not traceable in any of the Gospels.

3. In the Tradition related by Ibn Abbas, the

daughter of the tax-collector has been named Bint al-As. Luke and Mark have metioned her and said that she was the daughter of the chief of the temple. The Gospel-writers say that some messenger from the house of the chief came and brought the information that the girl was dead. Christ said that she was not dead. He said to the girl "Arise," and she rose.

We Muslims think that what Christ said was right that the girl was not dead. She was either overwhelmed by weakness or had fallen into a swoon.

She was healed by the blessings of Christ.

4. The Gospels are also silent with regard to the incident of Salim b. Nuh.

After this insufficient and vague claim of the Gospels, let us read the verses of the Qur'an regarding the miracles of Christ. How unambiguous are the descriptions of the Qur'an:

"And (appoint him) an apostle to the Children of Israel, (with this message): 'I have come to you with a Sign from your Lord, in that I make for you out of clay, as it were, the figure of a bird and breathe into it and it becomes a bird by God's leave: and I heal those born blind, and the lepers, and I quicken the dead, by God's leave: and I declare to you what ye eat, and what ye store in your houses. Surely therein is a Sign for you, if ye did believe" (iii. 49).

The Holy Qur'an does not go into details. It gives indications. This is the Book under the heavens today which confirms the miracles of the Prophets of the past. If the Holy Qur'an had remained silent on this point, the present versions of the Torah and the Bible would not have carried conviction with many unprejudiced persons on this matter. The Qur'an declares these miracles openly because, according to it, all the Prophets from Adam to Muhammad (peace be upon them) are links of the same golden chain. If a person belies one of them, he belies all. The Qur'an treats them all as the light of the eyes of the believers in Islam. If dispositions were sound, the Christian friends could not but confess till the last day that they owed a great obligation to the Qur'an for having confirmed the previous books.

Regarding these miracles of Christ, another thing has to be made clear. After giving a description of these miracles, the Christian priests raise the objection that when Christ was gifted with such astounding miracles which are without precedent, how can it be said that the Prophet of Islam stood above Christ in rank and sanctity? According to them, these miracles establish the superiority of Christ over the Prophet of Islam. In our view, in the discussion about miracles, it is bad taste to compare one Prophet with another. Was Christ gifted with the

miracles which were given to Moses or Abraham? If the answer is "No" and even Christians will say "No," shall we hold that Christ was inferior in rank to other Prophets? However, it cannot be said that the Prophet Muhammad (peace be on him) was not gifted with such miracles. These miracles and other greater miracles were performed to support the prophethood of Muhammad (peace be on him). But to arrive at this conclusion, the Christian priests would have to shake off their prejudices.

Sometime back a Christian priest, while delivering a speech in Hyderabad, repeated the same objection. A gentleman wrote a letter to a famous Pakistani religious scholar, Maulana Zafar Ahmad Usmani, seeking an answer from him to this objection. Thereupon another religious scholar, Maulana Muhammad Malik Kandhalvi, who belonged to the religious seminary of learning of Maulana Zafar Ahmad Usmani, wrote a reply. We quote below his letter in verbatim:

"Christ was not vested with prophethood and given the Bible in the lap of his mother, but it is true that he spoke to the people in the lap of his mother, as mentioned by the Qur'an, so that this miracle might establish the chastity of his mother and also establish the fact that this child was born without a father. Even if it is admitted that the book and prophethood were given to him in his mother's lap, this does not necessarily entail the superiority

of Christ over Muhammad (peace be on him). From the intellectual standpoint, a greater miracle consists in the fact that a whole nation sees a person for a full period of forty years in a condition in which he can neither read nor write. Then suddenly treasures of knowledge and truth begin to flow from his lips and he brings before them a book which challenges all the scholars to produce the like of it and the scholars are unable to do so. All the most eloquent persons in Arabia cannot produce a line which equals this book. This miracle is certainly greater than that of a child speaking in the lap of his mother."

Abu Hurairah relates that no one spoke in the lap of his mother except three infants: one was Jesus Christ, another who belonged to the time of Juraij and a third child.

For details, reference may be made to *Sahih Muslim* (a book of Traditions). Juraij was a pious and worshipful man who got into trouble because of his mother's curse. A wicked woman conceived after committing adultery with a shepherd near the church where he used to pray. When the child was born to her, she said that it was the child of Juraij. This new-born child spoke before the people and said that his father was the shepherd.

Another child was suckling at his mother's breast. A horseman passed by her. She prayed to God that her son might be like the horseman. The child spoke and said that God might not make him

like the horseman.

This shows that speaking in the mother's lap is not peculiar to Jesus Christ. Other children have done likewise to show the power of God. Then an authentic *hadith* (Tradition) says that the Prophet of Islam was vested with prophethood at a time when the body of Adam had not been created

The miracle of healing blind persons and quickening the dead to life was given to Jesus Christ because in his time the science of medicine had touched new heights and it is one of the established ways of God that He gives His Prophets that kind of miracles which accord with the genius of the time so that the world may see that it is beyond human power and that the power of God manifests itself in these miracles. During the time of Moses the art of sorcery had made the greatest development. Therefore, Moses was given miracles which dumbfounded the sorcerers and at the sight of these miracles the sorcerers accepted the leadership and prophethood of Moses. Similarly, during the time of the Prophet of Islam, the art of eloquent speech had made great advances. Therefore, the Prophet of Islam was given the miracle of the Qur'an whose eloquence stilled the voices of the greatest poets of his time. Also if one Prophet was not given the miracle which was given to another, this does not detract from the position of the former. If Moses and Jesus Christ

were not given the throne of Solomon, it denotes no defect in them. Similarly, if Solomon did not receive the miracle of the rod and luminous hand, this is no argument for downgrading him. If a sane view is taken of the matter, it will become clear that the miracle of the Qur'an excels all others, because the Qur'an is a miracle of intellect, and quickening the dead to life, the rod and the luminous hands are miracles which can only be perceived. Therefore, the miracle of intellect is higher than merely perceptible miracles. Moreover, perceptible miracles are of value only for the age and the time in which they were performed. After Moses no one saw the miracle of the rod or of the luminous hand. Similarly, the miracle of Jesus in quickening the dead to life is not present before us now. But the miracle of the Qur'an is still there and will continue till the end of time, inspiring people with belief in the truth of the Prophet's mission. That is why the Prophet of Islam declared: "Every Prophet was given miracles which induced the people to believe in him. What I have been given is the *Wahy* (Revelation of God), and I hope that on the Day of Judgment my people will outnumber other communities." (There is a tradition to this effect in *Sahih Muslim.*) History bears witness to the fact that this miracle succeeded beyond precedent. During the short period of twenty-three years, the whole of Arabia

came under the suzerainty of Islam. In the last pilgrimage of the Prophet, more than a hundred and twenty-five thousand Companions followed him, and twenty-five years after the death of the Prophet, the flag of Islam was fluttering from Arabia to Spain in one direction and from Sind to Samarqand in the other; when the Bible shows that all the miracles of Jesus Christ failed in their effect. No one believed in him except twelve disciples and among these twelve was one who had him arrested and crucified according to the Gospels. Then similar miracles and even greater than them were performed by the Prophet of Islam For example, pebbles glorified God, stones saluted him, a camel spoke to him, the pillar of Hannanah wept (Hannanah was a pillar against which the Prophet leaned when delivering his address in the mosque of Medina), and a fountain of water gushed forther from his fingers, two trees joined themselves together so that he might relieve himself and then separated at his command, a tree uprooted itself at his call and came before him and three times bore witness to the unity of God and the prophethood of Muhammad (peace be on him), when a person demanded of him: "Who can bear witness to your prophethood?" he said. "This tree," and called it and it bore witness; in his time a wolf spoke to a man and informed him of the advent of the Prophet, the miracle of ascension to heaven

when one night he travelled from Mecca to Jerusalem and then ascended the seven heavens. Finally, the moon split into two with the sign of his finger. All these happenings are authenticated by the Qur'an and other standard authorities. They are not in any way inferior to the miracles of Jesus Christ but rather superior to them. Because these things happened in a way which defy all rational explanation. About quickening the dead to life a sceptic may say that the person might not have been actually dead but fallen in a swoon. This sickness was healed by Christ. But glorification of God by pebbles, salutation by stones, gushing of a fountain through the fingers of the Prophet, the weeping of the pillar of Hannanah and the tree uprooting itself and bearing witness to the Prophet's truth are not susceptible of rational explanation. Even a shade of probability cannot be discovered by anyone in these incidents. This shows that these things are superior to the miracles performed by Jesus Christ.

ASCENSION TO HEAVEN OR CRUCIFIXION

God Almighty had favoured Christ with all kinds of extraordinary miracles. The object was that by observing them the people may become convinced that he was a Prophet sent by God and the argument may be clinched against his opponents. Thus the contents of the Gospels and the traditions show that Christ went from village to village and town to town performing these miracles. Wherever he went he healed the people spiritually as well as physically. People surrounded him everywhere with great devotion and love. The first who believed in him was a group of fishermen. According to the Bible, Christ went to them and said : "O Fishermen, come to me, I will teach how to cast your nets on men." The Qur'an calls them *Hawari* (disciples) which literally means those who wash clothes. The Bible says that they numbered twelve. Matthew has also given their names It is strange that those who believed in the Prophets, or, as the Qur'an calls them, "vanguards" (ix. 100), consisted mainly of poverty-stricken individuals without a standing in society. Here also the same phenomenon manifests itself. A few poor but

sincere men declared their faith in him and till the last day of life kept their word.

Seeing this, the Jews became very uneasy. The daily growing popularity of Christ was like poison to them. They tried every means, falsehood, slander, abuse, etc., but they were not successful. Now they could wait no more. They went to Pilate, the governor, a representative of the Romans. It must have been a sad sight when those who claimed to believe in one God and His Prophets approached a ruler who was an idol-worshipper so that they may have the messenger of truth crucified. In any case, they brought their complaint before Pilate. The following are the details given by John and Matthew:

"Then assembled together the chief priests, and the scribes, and the elders of the people, unto the palace of the high priest, who was called Caiaphas, and consulted that they might take Jesus by subtilty, and kill *him* . . ." (Matthew, xxvi, 3-4).

"Now the chief priests, and elders, and all the council, sought false witness against Jesus, to put him to death. But found none: yea, though many false witnesses came, *yet* found they none. At the last came two false witnesses, and said, This *fellow* said, I am able to destroy the temple of God, and to build it in three days. And the high priest arose, and said unto him, Answerest thou nothing? what *is it which* these witness against thee? But Jesus held his peace. And the high priest answered and said unto him, I adjure thee by the living God, that thou tell us whether thou be the Christ, the Son of God. Jesus saith unto

him, Thou hast said: nevertheless I say unto you, Hereafter shall ye see the Son of man sitting on the right hand of power, and coming in the clouds of heaven. Then the high priest rent his clothes, saying, He hath spoken blasphemy; what further need have we of witnesses? behold, now ye have heard his blasphemy. What think ye? They answered and said, He is guilty of death. Then did they spit in his face, and buffeted him; and others smote *him* with the palms of their hands saying, Prophecy unto us, thou Christ, Who is he that smote thou?" (Matthew, xxvi, 59-68).

"And Jesus stood before the governor: and the governor asked him, saying, Art thou the King of the Jews? And Jesus said unto him, Thou sayest. . . . Then said Pilate unto him, Hearest thou not how many things they witness against thee? And he answered him to never a word; insomuch that the governor marvelled greatly. Now at *that* feast the governor was wont to release unto the people a prisoner, whom they would. And they had then a notable prisoner, called Barabbas. Therefore when they were gathered together, Pilate said unto them, Whom will ye that I release unto you? Barabbas, or Jesus which is called Christ? For he knew that for envy they had delivered him. When he was set down on the judgment seat, his wife sent unto him, saying, Have thou nothing to do with that just mean: for I have suffered many things this day in a dream because of him. But the chief priests and elders persuaded the multitude that they should ask Barabbas, and destroy Jesus. The governor answered and said unto them, Whether of the twain will ye that I release unto you? They said, Barabbas. Pilate saith unto them, What shall I do then with Jesus which is called

Christ? *They* all say unto him, Let him be crucified. And the governor said, Why, what evil hath he done? But they cried out the more, saying, Let him be crucified. When Pilate saw that he could prevail nothing, but *that* rather a tumult was made, he took water, and washed his hands before the multitude, saying, I am innocent of the blood of this just person: see ye *to it*. Then answered all the people, and said, His blood *be* on us, and on our children Then released he Barabbas unto them: and when he had scourged Jesus, he delivered *him* to be crucified. Then the soldiers of the governor took Jesus into the common hall, and gathered unto him the whole band *of soldiers*. And they stripped him, and put on him a scarlet robe. And when they had platted a crown of thorns, they put *it* upon his head, and a reed in his right hand: and they bowed the knee before him, and mocked him, saying, Hail, King of the Jews! And they spit upon him, and took the reed, and smote him on the head And after they had mocked him, they took the robe off from him, . . . and led him away to crucify *him*. And as they came out, they found a man of Cyrene, Simon by name: him they compelled to bear his cross. And when they were come unto a place called Golgotha, that is to say, a place of a skull, they gave him vinegar to drink mingled with gall: and when he had tasted *thereof*, he would not drink. And they crucified him, and parted his garments, casting lots . . . And sitting down, they watched him there; and set up over his head his accusation written, THIS IS JESUS THE KING OF THE JEWS. Then there were two thieves crucified with him, one on the right hand, and another on the left. And they that passed by reviled him, wagging

their heads, and saying, Thou that destroyeth the temple, and buildest *it* in three days, save thyself. If thou be the Son of God, come down from the cross. Likewise also the chief priests mocking *him*, with the scribes and the elders said, He saved others; himself he cannot save. If he be the King of Israel, let him now come down from the cross, and we will believe him. He trusted in God; let him deliver him now, if he will have him: for he said, I am the Son of God. The thieves also, which were crucified with him, cast the same in his teeth Now from the sixth hour there was darkness over all the land unto the ninth hour. And about the ninth hour Jesus cried with a loud voice saying, ELI, ELI, LAMA SABACHTHANI? that is to say, My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me? Some of them that stood there, when they heard *that*, said, This *man* calls for Elias And straightway one of them ran, and took a spunge, and failed *it* with vinegar, and put *it* on a reed, and gave him to drink. The rest said, Let be, let us see whether Elias will come to save him. Jesus, when he had cried again with a loud voice, yielded up the ghost" (Matthew, xxvii, 11-50).

The readers should pardon us for these long excerpts but, for explaining the matter, there was no other alternative. After reading this sad story, you should judge for yourselves whether these details befit a great Prophet or the Son of God, in the words of the Christians. Does this scene of utter helplessness prove that Christ was God or does it prove his helplessness and more than ordinary weakness. God is All-Powerful; the attribute of power can never

be separated from Him. It is impossible that He should sometimes be so great and powerful and sometimes so weak and helpless that He cannot defend Himself. If Jesus was God, how is it that at the time of his crucifixion, the attribute of power and might was separated from him, and he was compelled to go to the gallows crying?

Let us set aside the conception of his being God. Consider this story from the point of view of ordinary human virtues. The elect of God are recognised in this world by their contempt of death. If they die in the path of God, they consider such a death as the gateway to eternal life. Even after sacrificing their life, they think that they have fallen short of what was expected of them. But the Bible, contrary to these recognised standards, gives a different picture of the feelings and emotions of Christ, namely, that when he was being crucified, he wished that this cup might be taken away from him. In other words, he might not die the death of a martyr. When this prayer remained unanswered, he cried and complained against God. He said: God! hast Thou forsaken me?

In our opinion, every fair-minded person will declare that this story is a slander against Christ, because this kind of conduct does not befit even an ordinary man, not to speak of a Prophet.

The Gospels have also drawn a very ignoble

picture of the disciples of Jesus. In the first place very few people believed in Christ. But of those who believed in him, about one Judas, the Bible says:

"Now when the even was come, he sat down with the twelve, and as they did eat, he said, Verily I say unto you, that one of you shall betray me. And they were exceedingly sorrowful, and began every one of them to say unto him, Lord, is it I? And he answered and said: He that dippeth *his* hand with me in the dish, the same shall betray me. The Son of man goeth as it is written of him: but woe unto that man by whom the Son of man is betrayed! it had been good for that man if he had not been born. Then Judas, which betrayed him, answered and said, Master, is it I? He said unto him, Thou hast said" (Matthew, xxvi. 20-25).

This is what Matthew says. John goes further and says that the devil had entered into Judas:

"When Jesus had thus said, he was troubled in spirit, and testified, and said, Verily, verily, I say unto you, that one of you shall betray me. Then the disciples looked one on another, doubting of whom he spake. Now there was leaning on Jesus' bosom one of his disciples, whom Jesus loved. Simon Peter therefore beckoned to him, that he should ask who it should be of whom he spake. He then lying on Jesus' breast saith unto him, Lord, who is it? Jesus answered, He it is, to whom I shall give a sop, when I have dipped *it*. And when he had dipped the sop, he gave *it* to Judas Iscariot, *the son* of Simon. And after the sop Satan entered into him" (John, xiii, 21-27).

This is a strange spectacle. The sop given by a Prophet should fill a man's mind with the knowledge of God, but what happens, according to John, is that after this sop Satan entered into him.

Now consider the conduct of Simon Peter, whom, according to John, Jesus loved. The beloved of the Prophet can be a liar, a hypocrite and a traitor, nay, one who denies his Prophet! The Bible says:

"Now Peter sat without in the palace: and a damsel came unto him, saying, Thou also wast with Jesus of Galilee. But he denied before *them* all, saying, I know not what thou sayest. And when he was gone into the porch, another *maid* saw him, and said unto them that were there, This *fellow* was also with Jesus of Nazareth. And again he denied with an oath, I do not know the man. And after a while came unto *him* they that stood by, and said to Peter, Surely thou also art *one* of them; for thy speech betrayeth thee. Then began he to curse and swear, *saying*, I know not the man" (Matthew, xxvi, 69-74).

You might think that if Judah and Simon Peter acted treacherously, it does not matter. There were other disciples of Christ and they must have been steadfast in their loyalty to Christ. But Matthew settles even this dispute. He says that at this time of adversity, not one or two, but all the disciples of Christ fled away:

"In that same hour said Jesus to the multitudes, Are ye come out as against a thief with swords and

staves for to take me? I sat daily with you teaching in the temple, and ye laid no hold on me. But all this was done, that the scriptures of the prophets might be fulfilled. Then all the disciples forsook him, and fled" (Matthew, xxvi, 55-56).

This is the Biblical story of the crucifixion. Now keep this story in view and study the facts stated by the Qur'an.

1. First of all the Qur'an refutes the allegations levelled by the Christians against the disciples of Christ saying:

"'Then Jesus found Unbelief on their part. He said: 'Who will be my helpers to (the work of) God?' Said the Disciples: 'We are God's helpers: we believe in God, and do thou bear witness that we are Muslims

"Our Lord! we believe in what Thou hast revealed, and we follow the Apostle; then write us down among those who bear witness'" (iii. 52-53).

The Qur'an says that the Jews were not able to crucify Christ. They were deceived, and, mistaking another person for him, crucified that person:

"But they killed him not, nor crucified him, but so it was made to appear to them, and those who differ therein are full of doubt, with no (certain) knowledge, but only conjectures to follow, for of a surety they killed him not;—nay, God raised him up unto Himself; and God is Exalted in Power, Wise" (iv. 157-158).

The Qur'an does not give details of how the

Jews were deceived about Christ. Ibn Kathir and other scholars have collected Traditions about this matter, the gist of which is that when Jesus was surrounded in his house where he stayed with his disciples with the intention of having him arrested, he addressed his disciples and said : "I will be raised by God to the heavens and someone among you will be made to resemble me, so that the Jews may mistake him for me and arrest him. Who is ready for this sacrifice?" Thereupon a disciple of his willingly undertook the sacrifice. God made him resemble Christ who was raised to the heavens. Some Traditions say that one of his disciples already bore great resemblance to him. When Christ was raised, the Jews mistook him for Christ and crucified him. Maulana Abdul Majid Darayabadi, a scholar of our time, has made researches on the subject He writes:

"All our commentators are agreed that the Jews were deceived and they crucified another person mistaking him for Christ. But who was this person and how they fell into deception, no answer to this question is given either by the Qur'an or by an authentic *hadith*. Now, there is no alternative except to weigh the details of the incident in the light of history and that version of the story should be adopted which is more probable and which fits in with the requirements of the situation. The first thing to be recalled in this connection is that Jesus Christ did not mix with the people of Jerusalem.

The result was that not only the common people but also the high-class society did not know him fully well. Therefore, when he was about to be arrested, the difficulty of recognising cropped up and the elders of the Jews as well as the large number of soldiers did not prove sufficient for the task. A person from amongst his own followers who was a traitor and a hypocrite had to be chosen for the task of recognising him. This is a pure historical reality but Imam Razi [d. 606/1210] knows of this secret and says that Jesus Christ was not recognised by the people except by his name (*Tafsir Kabir*). The reason was that he did not mix with the people.

"Both the Gospels of Matthew and Mark say that the soldiers who came to arrest Christ were accompanied by a multitude of Jews who bore sticks and swords Even so, they had to seek the help of Judah, the hypycrite. According to the Gospel of John, when the soldiers and those who accompanied him reached the place where Christ was staying, Christ asked them who it was they were seeking. They said: We are seeking Jesus of Nazareth. Jesus replied: I have already told you I am Jesus. The sacredness of the person of Jesus Christ is a product of the latter times. In the eyes of his antagonist contemporaries he was just Jesus of Nazareth, a notorious and obscure criminal. He was present before them, yet nobody recognised him. Another thing to be remembered is that, according to the Jews, Jesus prossessed an extraordinary power to change his shape. In the Gospels this power has been described as a miracle: 'And after six days Jesus taketh Peter, James, and John his brother, and bringeth them up into an high mountain apart, and

was transfigured before them: and his face did shine as the sun, and his raiment was white as the light' (Matthew, xvii, 1-2); 'And as he prayed, the fashion of his countenance was altered, and his raiment *was* white *and* glistening' (Luke, ix, 29).

"It is a separate discussion whether or not this was a miracle. But he had the power to do so. Thirdly, it should be remembered that the population of the country consisted of the Jews or the Israelites and Christ was a member of the Jewish community. But the country was ruled by the Romans. All the high officers, police and army consisted of the Romans, and the Romans were not only polytheists and different in religion from the Jews but also differed in their shape, form, dress, language and manners, just as today the British differ from the Indians, and just as the Indians think that all the British soldiers are alike in form and all the whites similarly take the blacks to be alike, the foreign Roman soldiers thought that all the Jews and Israelites were alike. The fourth point to be stressed is that the house where Jesus was to be crucified lay at a distance from the Roman court. The cross resembled the word T or a railway signal. The whole cross was not fixed at one place; only the straight pillar of the cross was fixed. The diagonal stick was, as a matter of rule, borne by the criminal himself, and he carried it to the place of crucifixion. After bearing in mind what has been said above, the following points should be taken into consideration:

"1. It was Friday when this order was given. The day was about to end and the Jews were anxious to go home before evening. With Friday evening began

their Sabbath and on the Sabbath day, it was prohibited to punish a criminal Then the Jewish feast was also about to begin In short, the Jews were in a hurry to crucify and bury this criminal.

"The lean and weak criminal (Christ) could not possibly bear the stick and do this distance quickly for the sake of the Jews, particularly when the Jewish children and mischievous Jews themselves were harassing him. Now, consider this whole situation and decide what the Roman soldiers could do in this situation when they were keeping guard over the criminal or rather the criminals (for there were two other criminals to be crucified) It is already known that they belonged to the ruling nation and were not subject people. They could not possibly bear the cross themselves. They did what any other person in their place would have done. They caught hold of one Jew and put the cross on his shoulders. The British guard in India would have acted identically, caught hold of some Indian and put the cross on his shoulders. This is no mere conjecture or probability The Gospels themselves make this point clear: 'And as they came out, they found a man of Cyrene, Simon by name: him they compelled to bear his cross' (Matthew, xxvii, 32). When this crowd, which was not an organised crowd but a multitude of common people, came to the place where Christ was to be crucified, pushing against each other, harassing the criminal and mocking at him, the Roman police guard withdrew, for their duty came to an end Now the sentries of the jail began their work. They did not know who was Jesus of Nazareth. They thought that the person who was bearing the cross was the criminal to be

crucified. Once again you should remember that in the sight of the Roman sentries of the jail all the Jews were strangers. All were of the same shape and form. They could hardly differentiate between one Israelite (Jesus of Nazareth) and another (Simon of Cyrene). Simon must have raised a hue and cry. But in the midst of the uproar of the multitude and due to the ignorance of the jail sentries about the language of the Israelites and also due to their hurry in crucifying the criminal, they caught hold of Simon and crucified him, while he continued to raise a hue and cry. In this tumult, Jesus must have made his escape and the enemies were deceived. The Qur'anic statement that 'so it was made to appear to them' is not a totally newly invented belief. It was held by a Christian sect, the Basilides (the founder of the sect died in A.D. 140). He openly declared that it was not Christ but Simon of Cyrene who was crucified."

Whatever may be the truth, whether Christ was raised to heaven from the house which was besieged by his enemies, or some disciple of his sacrificed himself for him, or he escaped from the Jews while coming to the place of his crucifixion, as stated by Maulana Abdul Majid Daryabadi, and then was raised to heaven, this does not touch the real issue. The truth remains that he could not be crucified by the Jews who failed in their efforts, while Christ was successful.

The Christian priests also try to involve the Muslims in a fallacy. They say that when the Muslims

admit that Christ is in heaven and the Prophet of Islam lies buried in the earth, this proves the superiority of Christ over Muhammad (peace be on him); why don't the Muslims admit this?

In our opinion this argument of the Christian priests is nothing more than a logical fallacy. We say: We do no deny the excellence of Christ. We believe that he was a great Prophet of God. To disrespect him denotes in our eyes lack of belief. But the standard of superiority foisted by you is based on sheer ignorance You believe that Christ is superior to angels. But do you know that innumerable angels were present in the heavens before Christ was born? They were also present in the heavens when Christ was preaching Islam on this earth and even now every nook and corner of the heavens bears the marks of the angels' prostrations. Or, take another example Birds fly in the heavenly space day and night, while man lives on the earth. Does this establish the superiority of birds over man? Superiority or inferiortiy does not lie in being above or below the earth Without meaning any disrespect to Christ, we say: Have you not seen that bubbles rise over the surface of the water, while pearls lie below in the depth of the occean? Will any wise man declare that bubbles are superior to pearls because the former rise above the surface of the water, while the latter lie below in the depth.

It is possible that the Christian priests may not give consideration to what we have said above. Therefore, we quote the Bible. The Old Testament says about Elijah:

"And it came to pass, as they still went on, and talked, that, behold, *there appeared* a chariot of fire, and horses of fire, and parted them both asunder; and Elijah went up by a whirlwind into heaven. And Elisha saw *it* and he cried, My father, my father, the chariot of Israel, and the horsemen thereof. And he saw him no more: and he took hold of his own clothes, and rent them in two pieces" (2 Kings, ii, 11-12).

This excerpt proves two things clearly:

1. That Elijah went up to heaven.
2. That he went up to heaven in a chariot.

The readers perhaps do not know that Elijah was the Prophet about whom the Jews and Christians held the belief that Christ will not appear unless he comes down from heavens. Therefore, when Christ was sent to the Israelites, they asked him whether he was Christ, and they themselves said, How he could be Christ when Elijah had not yet come? Christ answered them that Elijah had come and he is John the Baptist. Thus Elijah not only went to the heavens but came back to the earth in the person of John the Baptist. If ascension to heavens or descension therefrom is the standard of superiortiy, then it is quite clear that Elijah is

superior to Christ because he went to heavens before Christ and went there in a chariot. Then he came back to the earth in the person of John the Baptist. This also gives him superiortiy over Christ. According to the logic of the Christians, Elijah is not only superior to Christ, but to all other Prophets. Now the question is whether the Christian priests are ready to declare that Elijah is superior to Christ. If not, then why do they demand of us that we should consider him superior to Muhammad (peace be upon him) merely because he ascended the heavens?

Chapter 6

SOMETHING ABOUT THE GOSPELS

The Holy Qur'an says:

"And in their footsteps We sent Jesus the son of Mary, confirming the law that had come before him: We sent him the Gospel; therein was guidance and light, and confirmation of the Law that had come before him: a guidance and an admonition to those who fear God" (v. 49).

This verse shows that Jesus had been given by God a heavenly book called the Bible every word of which had been revealed by God. But today not only the Muslims but also Christian scholars doubt whether the book called the Bible contains every word revealed by God. There was a time when Christian scholars held this belief, but as science and knowledge advanced, they realised that this was not the case, until today they hesitate to declare that every word in the Bible has been revealed by God. A famous Christian priest writes:

"According to Muslim scholars, God speaks through revelation. That is, every word of the holy book is revealed. This is called verbal revelation. Is it necessary for the Christians to hold the same belief about the Bible? There was a time when all

Christian scholars held this belief. But in the early period of the Christian church, this was not so. At that time people thought that the sense and meaning of the Holy Books is revealed but, as far as can be known, the idea was not that every word has been dictated by the Holy Ghost."[1]

The *Encyclopaedia Biblica* discusses the question of the changes and alterations made in the books of the Bible and says that in the early period the Old Testament was not considered to be a revealed book. As regards the New Testament, the *Encyclopaedia* says:

"The N.T. in early times had no canonical authority and alterations and additions were actually made where they seemed improvements."[2]

In short, the revealed Bible mentioned by the Qur'an is nowhere to be found on this earth. If it had been discovered, it would have been written in the language of Christ and his disciples who spoke Hebrew because he was a Jew by race. But today all the Gospels existing are written in the Greek language and they have been translated from Greek into other languages. *Bible* literally means a book, and it consists of two parts. The first part is called the Old Testament, the other is called the New Testament. Here we are discussing the Gospels. There-

1. William Mitchen, *Problems of Christianity*, pp. 12-14.
2. *Encyclopaedia Biblica*, Vol. IV, p. 498.

fore, we will leave out the Old Testament and introduce the New Testament to our readers.

The Gospels are many in number. In the second century, when schism appeared among the Christians, every sect wrote a separate Gospel for itself in which it tried to quote the authority of Christ and his disciples in order to support its particular stand on religious doctrines. Apart from these Gospels, these sects also regarded as authortative many Epistles, which they hold were written by the disciples of Christ. There are about 113 such epistles. Slowly and gradually the Christian leaders realised the dangerous nature of this anarchical state of sffairs. At last the famous Council of Nicaea was held which decided that four Gospels (those of Matthew, Mark, Luke and John) and the Acts of the Apostles and St. Paul's thirteen Epistles, in all twenty-seven books, were authoritative. The collection of these books is called New Testament. These books were circulated by the orders of the Pope Glassios and even today the Christians regard books of the New Testament as authoritative.

Mutual Contradictions

In spite of this, these collections contain certain contradictions which detract a good deal from the greatness of the Holy Book.

1. 2 Samuel (viii, 4) says:

"And David took from him a thousand *chariots*, and seven hundred horsemen, and twenty thousand footmen."

1 Chronicles (xviii, 4) says:

"And David took from him a thousand chariots, and seven thousand horsemen, and twenty thousand footmen."

The number of horsemen given by Samuel is seven hundred, while that given by Chronicles is seven thousand, a difference of six thousand three hundred. Which number should be taken as correct?

2. Mentioning the disciple who will have him arrested, Christ says:

"He it is, to whom I shall give a sop, when I have dipped *it*" (John, xiii, 26).

Matthew (xxvi, 23) says:

"He that dippeth *his* hand with me in the dish."

But Luke (xxii, 21) says:

"But, behold, the hand of him that betrayeth me *is* with me on the table."

There is one incident but the Gospels treat it differently.

3. John (v, 43-44) mentions the birth-place of Jesus and says:

"Now after two days he departed thence, and went into Galilee. For Jesus himself testified, that a prophet hath no honour in his own country."

Thus, according to John, Jesus did not belong to Galilee but to some other place (Judah), but he left it and came to Galilee.

Now consider the statements of Matthew, Mark and Luke. They say that Jesus belonged to Galilee and he had said that a Prophet is not honoured in his own country (Matthew, xiii, 54-58 ; Mark, vi, 4; Luke, iv, 24).

4. 1 Kings (iv, 26) says:

"And Solomon had forty thousand stalls of horses for his chariots, and twelve thousand horsemen."

But 2 Chronicles (ix, 25) says:

"And Solomon had four thousand stalls fro horses and chariots and twelve thousand horsemen."

Here also there is a difference of thirty-six thousand stalls.

5. Matthew (xx, 20-21) says:

"Then came to him the mother of Zebedee's children with her sons. . . . She saith unto him, Grant that these my sons may sit, the one on thy right hand, and the other on thy left in thy kingdoom."

But Mark (x, 35-37) says:

"And James and John, the sons of Zebedee, come unto him. . . . They said unto him, Grant unto us that we may sit, one on thy right hand, and the other on thy left hand, in thy glory."

The other two Gospel-writers do not mention this event at all.

6. 1 Chronicles (xxi, 1) says:

"And Satan stood up against Israel, and provoked David to number Israel."

Here provocation has been attributed to Satan, but in 2 Samnel (xxiv, 1), it is attributed to the Lord:

"And again the anger of the Lord was kindled against Israel, and he moved David against them to say, Go, number Israel and Judah."

7. Matthew says at one place (iii, 4) about John the Baptist:

"And the same John had his raiment of camel's hair, and a leathern girdle about his loins; and his meat was locusts and wild honey."

But in xi, 18, the same Matthew says:

"For John came neither eating nor drinking, and they say, He hath a devil."

Improper Passages

1. The Song of Solomon says:

"A bundle of myrrh *is* my well-beloved unto me; he shall lie all night betwixt my breasts" (i, 13).

"King Solomon made himself a chariot of the wood of Labanon. He made the pillars thereof *of* silver, the bottom thereof *of* gold, the covering of it

of purple, the midst thereof being paved *with* love, for the daughters of Jerusalem" (iii, 9-10).

"How fair and how pleasant art thou, O love, for delights! This thy stature is like to a palm tree. . . . I will take hold of the boughs thereof: now also thy breasts shall be as clusters of the vine, and the smell of thy nose like apples; and the roof of thy mouth like the best wine for my beloved, that goeth *down* sweetly, causing the lips of those that are asleep to speak" (vii, 6-9)

"We have a little sister, and she hath no breasts; what shall we do for our sister in the day when she shall be spoken for?" (viii. 8).

2. "Now King David was old *and* stricken in years; and they covered him with clothes, but he got no heat. Wherefore, his servants said unto him, Let there be sought for my lord the king a young virgin: and let her stand before the king, and let her cherish him, and let her lie in thy bosom, that my lord the king may get heat. So they fought for a fair damsel throughout all the coasts of Israel, and found Ashibag a Shunammite, and brought her to the king" (1 Kings, i, 1-3).

3. "But king Solomon loved many strange women, together with the daughter of Pharaoh, women of the Moabites, Ammonites, Edomites, Zidonians and Hittites; of the nations *concerning* which the Lord said unto the children of Israel, Ye shall not go in to them, neither shall they come in unto you: *for* surely they will turn away your heart after their gods: Solomon clave unto these in love. And he had seven hundred wives, princesses, and three hundred concubines: and his wives turned away his heart. For

it came to pass, when Solomon was old, *that* his wives turned away his heart after other gods: and his heart was not perfect with the Lord his God, as *was* the heart of David his father" (1 Kings, xi, 1-4).

4. "And Lot went out of Zoar, and dwelt in the mountain, and his two daughters with him; . . . and he dwelt in a cave, he and his two daughters. And the firstborn said unto the younger, Our father *is* old, and there is not a man in the earth to come in unto us after the manner of all the earth: come, let us make our father drink wine, and we will lie with him, that we may preserve seed of our father. And they made their father drink wine that night: and the firstborn went in, and lay with her father; and he perceived not when she lay down, nor when she arose. And it came to pass on the morrow, that the firstborn said unto the younger, Behold, I lay yesternight with my father: let us make him drink wine this night also; and go thou in, *and* lie with him, that we may preserve seed of our father. And they made their father drink wine that night also: and the younger arose, and lay with him, and he perceived not when she lay down, and when she arose" (Genesis, xix, 30-35).

Matthew (xv, 22) says:

"And, behold, a woman of Canaan came out of the same coasts, and cried unto him, Have mercy on me, O Lord, *thou* Son of David: my daughter is grievously vaxed with a devil. . . . But he answered and said, I am not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel. . . . It is not meet to take the children's bread and to cast it to dogs."

In this excerpt, Christ is openly saying that his

mission is limited to the Israelites. Moreover, it is a matter worthy of deep consideration that he uses the word "dog" for the non-Israelites.

In the story of Adam and Eve, the Bible blames Eve persuading Adam to commit the sin. The Qur'an contradicts this and lays no blame on Eve. Moreover, the Bible says that Eve was given the following punishment for this crime:

"Unto the woman he said, I will greatly multiply thy sorrow and thy conception; in sorrow thou shalt bring forth children; and thy desire *shall* be to thy husband, and he shall rule over thee" (Genesis, iii, 16)

The crime is committed by Eve but every woman is punished with pangs at childbirth and the punishment is not lifted even after Christ has atoned for all the sins of humanity.

Respect for one's mother is enjoined by every religion. Even irreligious people and atheists consider it a duty to respect their mother. The Bible teaches the same lesson. But in this connection the conduct of Christ as depicted by the Bible is highly objectionable.

Matthew (xii, 46-50) says:

"While he yet talked to the people, behold, *his* mother and his brethren stood without, desiring to speak with him. Then one said unto him, Behold, thy mother and thy brothers stand without, desiring to speak with thee. But he answered and said

unto him that told him, Who is my mother? and who are my brothers? And he stretched forth his hand towards his disciples and said, Behold my mother and my brethren! For whosoever will do the will of my Father which is in heaven, the same is my brother, and sister, and mother."

The question arises whether the mother of Christ had committed any crime by expressing the desire to speak with him Was his mother so unworthy that he could not speak with her? Was his mother not one of those who did the will of the heavenly father, so that her son turned away from her? Could Jesus Christ use the words "who is my mother" for his mother?

St. John (ii, 1-4) says:

"And the third day there was a marriage in Cana of Galilee; and the mother of Jesus was there: and both Jesus was called, and his disciples, to the marriage. And when they wanted wine, the mother of Jesus said unto him, They have no wine. Jesus saith unto her, Woman, what have I to do with thee? mine hour is not yet come."

Unprejudiced Christians should consider coolly whether Jesus could address his mother with the words "Woman! what have I to do with thee"?

Chapter 7

THE BIBLE AND THE LAST PROPHET

The comments which we have made in the last chapter on the revealed nature of the Bible show that this book cannot be relied upon in finding the straight path of life. This Torah is not the Torah confirmed by the Qur'an, nor are these Gospels the Gospels which the Qur'an confirms. These are traditions collected by some unknown persons in which the character and life of Moses or Jesus have been depicted, but in a perverted form. In spite of this, it is a fact that these books sometimes give a glimpse of the forgotten truths or the truths which have been lost. Usually such passages are those where the authors, instead of displaying the feats of their historiography, content themselves with recording the statements of Moses, Jesus and other Prophets of Israel. In this chapter we will show how, in spite of all suppressions and perversions, the Bible contains even today many clear predictions about the advent of the last Prophet, Muhammad (peace be on him). In this chapter we shall deal with only a few predictions.

1. When Moses came to mount Sinai, God spoke

to the Israelites in fire, clouds and darkness. Thereupon they were terror-stricken and they said to Moses: You go and hear God from near. Thereupon Moses heard the speech of God. Some parts of this speech are recorded in Deuteronomy:

"I will raise them up a Prophet from among their brethren, like unto thee, and I will put my words in his mouth; and he shall speak unto them all that I shall command him. And it shall come to pass, *that* whosoever will not hearken unto my words which he shall speak in my name, I will require *it* of him. But the prophet, which shall presume to speak a word in my name, which I have not commanded him to speak, or that shall speak in the name of other gods, even that prophet shall die" (xviii, 18-20).

Our Christian friends claim that this prediction is not about the Prophet of Islam but about Christ. But unprejudiced observers can easily judge that this claim is unfounded. Let us try to find out from the signs mentioned above as to who is the promised Prophet.

(*a*) The first point to be noted is that it has been predicted that the promised Prophet will come "from among thy brethren," that is, the brethren of Israelites. This is not true of Jesus Christ because he was not from amongst the brethren of Israelites. He belonged to the Israelites themselves. In the first chapter of this book we have

referred to the Gospels and noted the genealogy of Christ. In this genealogy Christ has been clearly mentioned as belonging to the Israelites. The Christian world cannot deny this even today. This is a sign which is true only of the Prophet of Islam who belonged to Ishmaelites who were the brethren of Israelites.

(*b*) The second characteristic mentioned in the prediction is that he will be "like unto thee," that is, like Moses. Now Moses bore the following characteristics:

(*i*) He was not born without a father.

(*ii*) He had brought with him a Code of Law.

(*iii*) He delivered the Israelites from the thraldom of Pharaoh.

(*iv*) He was a ruler.

Christ was not like Moses in any of these respects:

(*i*) He was born without a father.

(*ii*) He did not bring with him any Code of Law.

According to Christian terminology, he was not a Prophet at all. He was the son of God. According to Matthew, Christ did not bring any new Code of Law. He only wanted to put a new life into the Mosaic law:

"Think not that I am come to destroy the law, or the prophets: I am not come to destroy but to fulfil. For verily I say unto you, Till heavens and

earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled" (Matthew, v, 17-18).

Not only this. The disciples of Jesus even claim that he was come to deliver them from the bondage of law. Their words are too gentlemanly and respectful:

"And the law is not of faith: but, The man that doeth them shall live in them. Christ has redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us: for it is written, Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree" (Galatians, iii, 12-13).

(*iii*) Christ did not deliver any nation from foreign bondage.

(*iv*) He was a Prophet but not a ruler.

Now let us see how close is the resemblance of the Prophet of Islam with Moses.

(*i*) He was born according to the normal law of nature.

(*ii*) He brought with him a Code of Law.

(*iii*) He delivered the Arabs from the bondage of non-Arabs.

(*iv*) He was a Prophet as well as a ruler.

These and other points of resemblance have occasioned the declaration of the Qur'an:

"We have sent to you (men) an apostle, to be a witness concerning you, even as We sent an apostle to Pharaoh" (lxxiii. 15).

(*c*) The third sign is that God will put His word in his mouth and he will tell them all that had been commanded. God must surely have put His word in the mouth of Christ. But the question is whether it exists today. Are the Gospels the word of God? We have caught a glimpse of them in the previous pages and we have seen that they do not hesitate to call Jesus Christ an accursed one. On the contrary, let us have a look at the quality of the Prophet of Islam. The Qur'an declares:

"Nor does he say (aught) of (his own) Desire. It is no less than inspiration sent down to him" (liii. 3-4).

Addressing the Prophet of Islam, the Qur'an says:

"O Apostle! proclaim the (Message) which hath been sent to thee from thy Lord" (v. 70).

History bears witness to the fact that on the occasion of the Last Pilgrimage, the Prophet of Islam asked the audience three times whether he had communicated to them the message of God. When all the people answered in the affirmative, the Prophet raised his finger to the heavens and said: "My Lord! be a witness that I have communicated Thy message." The Prophet did all this because the sign mentioned in the Bible for him is that he will tell them all that he has been commanded. The

Qur'an further put a seal on the Prophet's claim by saying: "This day have I perfected your religion for you, completed My favour upon you" (v. 4).

(*d*) The fourth sign described is that he will speak the words of God in the name of God. But the words spoken by Christ are not in the name of God. None of the Gospels can furnish a proof of this. This prediction is, however, true of the Prophet of Islam. You can judge this by the words of the first revelation received by the Prophet in the cave of Hira:

"Proclaim! (or Read) in the name of thy Lord and Cherisher, Who created" (xcvi. 1).

Besides, have a look at the Qur'an every chapter of which opens with the words "In the name of God, Most Gracious, Most Merciful."

(*e*) Then again it is said that if anyone does not hearken to him, "I will call him to account." This accountability does not mean the accountability of the Hereafter. Because in the Hereafter everyone who denies a Prophet will be called to account. Here it means that those who deny the Prophet and those who oppose him will meet a painful end in this very life. When we study the life of Christ from this aspect, we find that, according to the Bible and the Christians, he died a helpless death being crucified by his opponents and his slayers come back happy and successful. Those who denied him

were not called to account by God in this life. On the contrary, if we look at the life of the Prophet of Islam we find that every one of his enemy met with disgrace in this world. The Jews who intrigued against him in Medina were either killed or exiled. Abu Jahl, Abu Lahb and other chiefs of the Quraish polytheists met with an unhappy end.

(*f*) The sixth point stressed is that if he speaks something "in my name which I have not commanded him to speak, he shall die" (i e. he shall be killed). Keeping this in mind, consider the verse of the Qur'an which says the same thing in its own style:

"And if the apostle were to invent any sayings in Our name, We should certainly seize him by the right hand, and We should certainly then cut off the artery of his heart" (lxix. 41-46).

2. Now let us have a look at another prediction of the Bible:

"And this *is* the blessing, wherewith Moses the man of God blessed the children of Israel before his death. And he said, The Lord came from Sinai, and rose up from Seir unto them; he shined forth from the mount Paran, and he came with ten thousands of saints[1]: from his right hand *went* a fiery law

1. In the beginning the Bible contained the words "ten thousand". But when the Muslims said that this is the number of the Companions of the Prophet of Islam and proves his truthfulness, these words in the Bible were changed. Now the words are ten thousands in plural.

for them" (Deuteronomy, xxxiii, 1-2).

This is a declaration that three great Prophets will be raised by God. The first is Moses who is related to Mount Sinai. The second is Christ who appeared from Seir. Seir is a mountain in Syria. This is also the name of a nation descended from Jacob, the name of which has been mentioned as Banu Ashir. The third is the Prophet of Islam who appeared on the mount Faran (Paran). Where is this mount Faran? The Bible itself says that Ishmael lived in the desert of Faran.

The Arabs are called children of Ishmael, who lived in Faran, a mountain between Mecca and Medina. The Qur'an mentions it in its first part and says that here Abraham and Ishmael laid the foundation of the Ka'bah. More light is thrown on this by the prediction of the Prophet Habakkuk:

"God came from Teman, and the Holy One from mount Paran. Selah. His glory covered the heavens, and the earth was full of his praise. And *his* brightness was as the light; he had horns *coming* out of his hand: and there *was* the hiding of his power. Before him went pestilence, and burning coals went forth at his feet. He stood, and measured the earth: he beheld, and drove asunder the nations" (Habakkuk, iii, 3-6).

In this prediction of Habakkuk mention has been made of mount Paran after which it has been said:

"the earth was full of his praise". Consider these words. Are they not an exact translation of Muhammad? Who is the person praised with whose praise the earth was filled? Is it not Muhammad (peace be on him)? Then consider the words: "he beheld, and drove asunder the nations". Was it Christ who, according to the Christians, was crucified? Was it Moses many years after whose death the Israelites entered the Holy Land? If you consider the historical facts with an unprejudiced eye, you will be convinced that it was Muhammad, the Last Prophet (peace be on him) whose look tore asunder the nations and who appeared on mount Paran (Faran).

Another sign mentioned in this passage is that he came with ten thousand saints. It has been proved by the books of Tradition and the biographies of the Prophet of Islam that when the Prophet entered Mecca, he had with him ten thousand Companions who were all warriors and he came with a fiery code of law; in other words, he came with the intention of undertaking *Jehad* (Holy war) to conquer Mecca.

3. In the Song of Solomon, Prophet Solomon says:

"My beloved *is* white and ruddy, the chiefest among ten thousand. His head *is as* the most fine gold, his locks *are* bushy, *and* black as a raven. His eyes *are as the eyes* of doves by the rivers of water,

washed with milk, *and* fitly set. His cheeks *are* as a bed of spices, *as* sweet flowers; his lips *like* lilies, dropping, sweet smelling myrrh. His hands *are as* gold rings set with the beryl; his belly *is as* bright ivory overlaid *with* sapphires. His legs *are as* pillars of marble, set upon sockets of fine gold; his countenance *is* most sweet; yea, he *is* altogether lovely" (v, 10-16).

A little before these verses it is said: "What *is* thy beloved more than *another* beloved . . . ?" (verse 9). In other words, how the Prophet who is to come is superior to all other Prophets? A little further this question has been answered. Solomon depicts the countenance of the Prophet of Islam in the most loving manner. He also tells that on a certain occasion he will be accompanied by ten thousand followers ready to sacrifice their lives for him. Then he says: he is altogether lovely. In the Hebrew language, instead of the word "lovely," the word "Muhammadaim" has been used. The scholars of Hebrew say that the suffix "aim" in Hebrew is used for respect, as in the Bible "Uluhaim" has been used for God instead of "Uluh" or as "Ba'laim" for "Ba'l". This shows that here the exact word was "Muhammad" but out of respect it was changed into "Muhammadaim". After this, the Christian translator further changed it out of shape.

4. Isaiah (ix, 6-7) says:

"For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given: and the government shall be upon his shoulder: and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, The mighty God, the everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace. Of the increase of *his* government and peace, *there shall be* no end, upon the throne of David, and upon his kingdom, to order it, and to establish it with judgment and with justice from henceforth even for ever. The zeal of the Lord of hosts will perform this."

In this prediction also we have been informed about a Prophet who is to come. As usual, the Christians have tried hard to fit it forcibly on Jesus Christ. But justice must be done. The names given in this prediction for the Prophet to come are such that not even one name bears any resemblance to the characterisic qualities of Christ.

First of all, it is said that "the government shall be upon his shoulders". Was Christ the founder of any state? The Prophet of Islam, however, had a government on his shoulders.

In this prediction it has been said that his name is "Wonderful". There is nothing to wonder in the names of Jesus and Christ. Jesus or Isa means a man of red colour. Masih is derived from *Masah.* There is nothing very particular about it. Muhammad, of course, is a wonderful name. Just as the Prophet of Islam was an embodiment of all virtues, his name also is an excellent name from phonetic as well as

from literary viewpoint. No one else bore this name. According to some Traditions, a few people gave this name to their children out of a desire that he should fulfil the predictions of the heavenly books. The second name is "Counsellor". This also fits upon the Prophet of Islam. Addressing him, God says: "And consult them in the affair" (iii. 159); "Who conduct their affairs by mutual Consultation" (xlii. 38)

The Prophet himself says: "There is no caliphate (government) except by consultation."

Does the New Testament say that Jesus was a counsellor?

The third name given is "Everlasting Father". It is the Holy Prophet of Islam who was made the seal of the Prophets and whose code of law will function for ever. Christ himself says: "I will request my Father, and he will give you a comforter, who will live with you for ever" (John).

This Prophet who is to come was called by him the Prince of Peace. The Prince of Peace can only be a person whose religion is called peace (Islam); whose followers pray for the peace and safety of the whole world in their worship; who taught that when you meet one another you should greet the other fellow with the words "Peace be upon you"; who said to his enemies: "Let this day no reproach be (cast) on you" (xii. 92); whose Qur'an brings

the good news: "Peace be upon you! Well have ye done. Enter ye here to dwell therein" (xxxix. 73).

Then it is said: "Of the increase of government and peace there shall be no end." Christ was never associated with government. No question, therefore, arises about its increase or safety. The government was given to the Prophet of Islam whose Companions brought the whole world under its sway.

5. After Christ was raised to the heavens, one of his disciples received a revelation which he has put in the following words:

"And I saw heaven opened, and behold a white horse; and he that sat upon him *was* called Faithful and True, and in righteousness he doth judge and make war. His eyes *were* as a flame of fire, and on his head *were* many crowns; and he had a name written, that no man knew, but he himself. And he *was* clothed with a vesture dipped in blood; and his name is called The Word of God. And the armies *which were* in heaven followed him upon white horses, clothed in fine linen, white and clean. And out of his mouth goeth a sharp sword, that with it he should smite the nations: and he shall rule them with a rod of iron: and he treadeth the winepress of the fierceness and wrath of Almighty God. And he hath on *his* vesture and his thigh a name written, KING OF KINGS, AND LORD OF LORDS" (Revelation, xix, 11-16).

In this revelation, the signs given of the person

whom John met in this revelation show that he was no other person but Prophet Muhammad.

(*i*) It is said that he was a horseman riding a white horse. Revelation (vi, 2) makes it clear that: "And I saw, and beheld a white horse and he that sat on him had a bow ; and a crown was given unto him : and he went forth conquering and to conquer." About the horsemen, it is said in this revelation that (1) he will ride a white horse ; (2) that he had a bow ; (3) he came forth conquering. None of these signs is true of Christ. The Gospels do not mention that he ever rode a white horse, or that he ever had a bow in his hand, or that he made some conquest. There is no question of conquest in the case of Christ for he never fought a battle ; on the other hand, look at Prophet Muhammad (peace be on him) :

(*a*) The biographies of the Prophet show that he always had a white horse named "Bahr" among his riding beasts.

(*b*) He had a bow in his hand. Not only in wars but also when he delivered an address, he had a bow in his hand. He said : "It is necessary for you to shoot arrows." He also said : "Shoot arrows. Your forefather also shot arrows." Forefather here refers to Ishmael about whom the Bible itself says that Ishmael "dwelt in the wilderness, and became an archer" (Genesis, xxi, 20).

(*c*) God gave him many victories. His Compan-

ions planted the standard of Islam among the Arabs and non-Arabs.

(*ii*) Then it is said that he is called the Faithful and True. The Prophet Muhammad (peace be on him) was called the True and Trustworthy, not only by his followers, but also by his opponents.

(*iii*) "In righteousness he doth judge and make war." This is also true of Prophet Muhammad (peace be on him). Even non-believers agreed that he judged in righteousness. Before the call to prophethood, the manner in which he did justice in having the Black Stone installed in the Ka'bah evoked the admiration of all the people. In his Traditions and in the Qur'an the doing of justice has been repeatedly stressed. It has also been said that he makes war. Against whom Christ made war, and when and where ? Can our Christian friends cite one example of this ? This warrior in the path of God was no other than the Prophet of Islam about whose wars Europe still indulges in false propaganda

(*iv*) It is said that his eyes were as a flame of fire and on his head were many crowns. Flames of fire denote his extraordinarily awe-inspiring personality. Those who have given details of his features have said that there were red lines in his eyes He had many crowns on his head. This passage indicates that the Prophet Muhammad (peace be on him) was a man of many attainments. He was the last Prophet

of God. He was the ruler of the Arabs and also an ascetic. He was a general and a warrior, a judge as well as a magistrate. The Qur'an itself has invited attention to the diverse aspects of his prophethood in the following verses :

"O Prophet ! truly We have sent thee as a Witness, a Bearer of Glad Tidings, and a Warner,—and as one who invites to God's (Grace) by His leave, and as a Lamp spreading Light" (xxxiii. 45-46).

(*v*) Then it is said that he had a name written that no man knew but he himself. This part of the passage refers to the miraculous significance of the many names of the Prophet of Islam. We have already referred to a prediction which lays stress on the greatness of his name. The readers should consult it again.

(*vi*) "And he was clothed in a vesture dripped in blood." This refers to the injuries inflicted on his teeth in the Battle of Uhud, the sinking of his armour in his body in the same battle and his becoming smeared with blood. In the journey to Ta'if also, he received serious bodily injuries. When and where did Jesus Christ clothe himself with the vesture of blood ? If, as the Christians say, he was hanged on the Cross, even then his clothes could not be smeared with blood.

(*vii*) Then it is said, "His name is called The Word of God." Can the name of Christ be considered

the word of God ? The four Gospels ascribed to him may be analysed as follows :

(*a*) Matthew's Gospel was originally in Hebrew. It was rendered into Greek. But none knows who its translator was.

(*b*) There is difference of opinion among the Christians themselves with regard to the Gospel of Mark as to when it was written. The most probable view is that it was written sixty-one years after Christ. Is it possible that the original words of Jesus may have been preserved after sixty-one years ?

(*c*) Luke was not a contemporary of Christ. He himself says in the first chapter of his Gospel :

"Even as they delivered them unto us, which from the beginning were eye witnesses, and ministers of the word ; it seemed good to me also, having had perfect understanding of all things from the very first, to write unto thee in order, most excellent Theophilles" (verses 2-3).

How can a book be the word of God which was written after making enquiries from the eye-witnesses, and this too after Jesus Christ was no more in this world.

(*d*) The fourth Gospel has been ascribed to John. But many Christian scholars hold that its ascription to John is false. The author of the book *al-Fariq Bain al-Makhluq wa'l-Khaliq* has collected many references of the Christian scholars which

throw light on this subject. It is only the Qur'an about which it can be said openly and publicly that it was written during the time of the Prophet of Islam. God Himself has undertaken the responsibility for its preservation: "It is for Us to collect and to promulgate it" (lxxv. 17).

The Traditions show that the whole of the Qur'an was recited before the Prophet every Ramazan. In the year in which he died the Qur'an was recited twice before him. In every age, countless Muslims have learnt the Qur'an by heart. If all the copies of the Qur'an are destroyed, the Qur'an can be rewritten with the help of those who have memorised it.

(*viii*) Then it is said: "The armies which were in heaven followed him." The armies of the heaven mean angels. White vesture denotes that they are spiritual beings. The Qur'an itself declares that in the battles of Uhud and Badr, angels descended from heaven. The Qur'an also says about the Prophet: "The angels will back (him) up" (lxvi. 4).

(*ix*) Then it is said: "And out of his mouth goeth a sharp sword" and "he shall rule with a rod of iron". Is any of these true of Christ? Of course, the Prophet of Islam ruled with a rod, since the Qur'an mentions the word *hadid* or iron in some of its passages. A sharp sword came out of his mouth which destroyed the unbelievers and pre-

sented the spectacle of:

"Say, Truth has (now) arrived and Falsehood perished: for Falsehood is (by its nature) bound to perish" (xvii. 81).

It was the sword of the Prophet of Islam which descended on the unbelievers as the wrath of God Almighty.

(*x*) The last sign mentioned is that he will be the king of kings and lord of lords. He is no other than the Prophet of Islam whom God called the Seal of the Prophets and who led all the other Prophets in prayer on the night of ascension.

6. John (xvi, 7-16) says:

"Nevertheless I tell you the truth: It is expedient for you that I go away: for if I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you; but if I depart, I will send him unto you. And when he is come, he will reprove the world of sin, and of righteousness, and of judgment: of sin, because you believe not on me; of righteousness, because I go to my Father and ye see me no more; of judgment, because the prince of this world is judged I have so many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now. Howbeit, when he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he will guide you into all truth; for he shall not speak of himself; but whatsoever he shall hear, *that* shall he speak: and he will shew you things to come He shall glorify me: for he shall receive of mine, and shall shew it unto you. All things that the Father hath are mine: therefore said I, that he shall take of mine, and shall shew it unto you."

(*i*) In this prediction it is said that he who is to come will bear the name, Spirit of truth. Originally, the word used here was Paraclete. It was perverted by the Greek translators. In the Urdu translation of the Bible sometimes it is said that he is a comforter and sometimes it is said that he is the spirit of truth, although it has been proved that Paraclete has been used for Ahmad.

(*ii*) When the Prophet of Islam came, he held that the Jews were guilty of denying Christ. He glorified Jesus Christ by having him recognised as a great Prophet. He cleared Mary of all the charges laid on her door by the Jews, and he declared that the picture of Jesus as dying of crucifixion while crying is false.

(*iii*) "He will show the way of truth." "And he who brings the Truth" (The Qur'an, xxxix. 33).

(*iv*) "He will not speak for himself." "Nor does he say (aught) of (his own) Desire. It is no less than inspiration sent down to him" (liii. 3-4).

(*v*) "And he will show you things to come." This passage is referring to the Prophet of Islam's prediction concerning the future history of mankind till the end of time.

7. John (i, 19-22) says:

"And this is the record of John, when the Jews sent priests and Levites from Jerusalem to ask him, Who art thou? And he confessed, and denied not;

but confessed, I am not the Christ And they asked him, What then? Art thou Elias? And he saith, I am not. Art thou that prophet? And he answered, No."

This excerpt shows that the Jews believed in the coming of three Prophets: (*i*) Elias who, according to their belief, was to come a second time, (*ii*) Christ, (*iii*) that prophet whose advent had been predicted by Moses.

In our opinion the belief in the second coming of Elias was unfounded. But if he was to come at all, Christ had already decided the matter by saying that John the Baptist is Elias: "And if ye will receive *it*, this is Elias, which was for to come" (Matthew, xi, 14).

Now there remain only two persons (*i*) Christ and (*ii*) "that prophet". It is clear that they are two different persons because when John the Baptist was asked about Christ, he denied that he was Christ. Then he was asked whether he was "that prophet". Christ had already come. "That prophet" was to come after him. Can the Christians tell who was "that prophet" after Christ except Muhammad (peace be on him)?

8. Mark says in his Gospel (i, 6-8):

"And John was clothed with camel's hair, and with a girdle of a skin about his loins; and he did eat locusts and wild honey and preached, saying,

There cometh one mightier than I after me, the latchet of whose shoes I am not worthy to stoop down and unloose. I indeed have baptized you with water, but he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost."

Who was the Prophet to baptise with the Holy Ghost after John the Baptist? If it is said he was Christ, then this is wrong, because Christ himself has said: I tell the truth of those born of women, none is a greater baptiser than John. This means that, according to Christ, among the people born of women till his time (and he himself was born of a woman, named Mary, who was a holy woman) no one was greater than John, but John says that he is not worthy of unloosing the latchet of the shoes of him who is to come. This shows that the person referred to by John is Muhammad (peace be on him), because the man who baptised with the Holy Ghost was not Christ but Muhammad (peace be uon him). Christ himself said that he did not baptise with the Holy Ghost. That Prophet would come after him who would baptise people with the Holy Ghost. In the Acts of the Apostles (i, 4-5), it is said:

"And, being assembled together with *them*, commanded them that they should not depart from Jerusalm, but wait for the promise of the Father which, *saith he*, ye have heard of me. For John truly baptized with water; but ye shall be baptized

with the Holy Ghost not many days hence" (verses 4-5).

9. Matthew (xxiii, 38-39) says:

"Behold, your house is left unto you desolate. For I say unto you, Ye shall not see me henceforth, till ye shall say, Blessed *is* he that cometh in the name of the Lord."

This passage shows that Jesus Christ is about to be raised and he will not come back again until he comes who will come in the name of the Lord, and until people call him blessed, that is, believe him. This Prophet who is to come in the name of the Lord is the unlettered Prophet (Muhammad). When he comes and people have believed in him, Christ will descend again.

10. John (xiv, 25-27) says:

"These things I have spoken unto you, being *yet* present with you. But the Comforter, *which is* the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name, he shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you."

"Whom the Father will send in my name" means that he will confirm "my teachings and remove from me all the accusations levelled by the Jews". This further means that during his prophethood, religion will be perfected, as the Qur'an says: "This day I have perfected your religion." ". . . And bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have

saidunto you." This shows that the world will have forgotten the teachings of Christ. People will ascribe false stories to him. He who is to come will bring all those things to the remembrance of the people which were said by Christ. About the one who was to come Jesus had said: "Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand" (Matthew, iv, 17).

It is not our purpose in this chapter to recount all Biblical predictions. We have cited a few examples before our readers with brief explanations. Those who know the Arabic language should refer to Ibn Taimiyyah's book entitled *al-Jawab-al-Sahih* (Vol. III) where they can find all predictions. It is a matter of regret that, instead of profiting from the works of the Islamic scholars, the Christians began to change the text of the Bible. We have already referred in this chapter to the change made by them in increasing the number of ten thousand saints and, instead, saying that there were hundreds of thousands of saints.

In the 1917 English translation of the *Scoffield Reference Bible* the words "ten thousand saints" are found, but the Urdu translators of the Bible felt that this is exactly the number of the Companions of the Holy Prophet of Islam at the time of the conquest of Mecca, and changed this number into hundreds of thousands. In connection with these predictions, it would not be out of place to mention

the Gospel of Barnabas. This Gospel which was banned by the orders of Pope Glassios in the fifth century A.D. was found by a Christian father Framernio. He found it in the library of Pope Sextus of Rome. When he studied this Gospel, he discovered many clear predictions in it about Muhammad (peace be upon him), the Last Prophet, so much so that his name Ahmad was also mentioned in it. On this occasion you should remember the words of Christ:

"O Children of Israel, I am the apostle of God (sent) to you, confirming the Law (which came) before me, and giving Glad Tidings of an Apostle to come after me, whose name shall be Ahmad" (The Qur'an, lxi 6).

After this discovery, he took this book of the library of the Pope and proclaimed his faith in Islam. The Gospel of Barnabas has been translated into Arabic by Syed Rashid Rida and has been published. This Gospel furnishes a conclusive argument to the Christians that Muhammad (peace be uon him) was the Last Prophet.

Chapter 8

DOCTRINE OF TRINITY

After Christ was raised to the heavens, his followers had to face very difficult conditions for a long time. To believe in Christ was a crime of the first order. Those who believed in him found more peace and safety in the deserts and forests than in the cities. This was the beginning of asceticism in Christianity. Although this accident arose out of a historical necessity, yet this historical necessity bred an extremist attitude and temper among the Christians. To inflict unnecessary hardships on oneself, to abandon the innocent pleasures of life and to withdraw from one's relations and one's family were regarded as necessary for piety and God-consciousness. Afterwards conditions changed and, when Christianity became popular, this extremism found its way in the devotion and love which the Christians had for Jesus, until they elevated him to the position of the son of God. If the evolution of Christian doctrines is studied, it will be seen that in the third century A.D. there were deep differences among the Christians about the person of Christ. This caused anxiety to Constantine the Great. He gathered

representatives of all the leading schools of thought and tried to have St. Paul's views recognised as being authentic. A Christian priest has given the following description of these differences and the subsequent agreement evolved in his book on the *History of Christian Chruch*: "Constantine the Great, with a view to resolving the disputes among the Churchmen sent Hosius, the Bishop of Cordova in Spain, who was his adviser in religious affairs, to Alexandria and also despatched letters to Alexander and Arius in which he wrote that this dispute was a mere quarrel of words. The Divine secrets are above human understanding. This gave rise to more trouble in Alexandria where there were riots. Hosius, the Bishop of Cordova, came back to the Emperor and acquainted him with the situation. Because the matter in dispute had to be settled and there were other difficulties, the Emperor called a council of all the bishops of the churches in the city of Nicaea in Bythinya in about A.D. 325 Although many councils had been held before this, they were local councils which decided local disputes. But this council was an ecumenical council in which representatives of all churches were required to declare their faith. In this council assembled about fifteen hundred delegates and more than three hundred bishops who had come mostly from eastern churches. Because, apart from the Arian question,

there were other points of dispute, the council lasted for three months. The opening address was read by the Emperor himself. Although the Emperor took part in the discussions, the matter under dispute was left in the hands of the presidents of the council. There were three parties in this council:

"(*a*) *Orthodox, who numbered about thirty*. Their leaders were Alexander, Amasius, Hosius and Athanasius who was the arch-deacon of Alexandria.

"(*b*) *Conservatives who numbered about two hundred.* Their leader was Eusebeus, bishop of Caesaria. These people did not agree with Arius, but they thought that no harm would come to the church from the Arian doctrine. Therefore, Arius should be dealt with leniently.

"(*c*) *Arians whose leader was Arius*. He had with him Eusebeus, the bishop of Nicomedia, and some eastern bishops who agreed with Arius.

"After much discussion, eighteen Arians under the leadership of the bishop of Nicomedia presented to the council an Arian Creed. But a great uproar followed and the Creed was torn to pieces. All the friends of Arius forsook him thereupon, and Arianism was rejected. After this the bishop of Caesaria, Eusebeus, presented a Creed which had gained currency in his church. The council adopted this Creed as the orthodox creed. Thereupon Arthanasius suggested the following additions to the Creed:

"(*a*) The only son of God with the explanation that he was consubstantial with the Father.

"(*b*) Not made but begotten.

"(*c*) He was of the same substance as the Father.

"All this was approved of by the council and in conclusion a curse was proclaimed on those who believed that there was a time when Christ was not, he was created out of nothing, the Father and the son were not of the same substance. He is created and subject to change. The orthodox Creed was approved of by the council together with the additions suggested by Athanasius and the curses referred to above. All the bishops except two signed the Creed. So Arius and the bishops were exiled and the writings of Arius were ordered to be burnt."[1]

The readers must have caught a glimpse of the doctrinal differences of the Christians as described by a Christian author himself. This excerpt is sufficient to prove that ideas such as that Jesus Christ was the son of God and that the three are one and one is three were not heavenly ideas but the creation of the human mind which were approved of by a council held three centuries after Christ. The author of this excerpt confined himself to writing that Arius and two bishops were exiled for differing with this Creed. But the fact is that this meaningless Creed always continued to give rise to differences and in

1. *History of Christian Church*, pp. 173-75.

later times many Christian sects openly declared their opposition to the orthodox Creed. Thus the Ebionites declared in clear words that Christ was not the son of God. He was a man and he had no share in divinity.

The Sabellians said that the three persons refer to the unity of God and God has spoken of Himself in those three different ways.

Then the Christian sects were also deeply divided about the Father, the son and the Holy Ghost.

The Arians said that Christ was not eternal like the Father. He was created before this universe. Nevertheless, he was not begotten but created.

The Macedonians said that there are only two persons of the Trinity The Holy Ghost is not a person. He is a created being. The Greek Church openly refused to admit that the Holy Ghost came into existence not only from the Father but from the father and son both.

In the thirteenth century three more sects denied the truth of Trinity.

The Unitarians believed in one God. Some sects believed in Trinity, but they put Mary in place of the Holy Ghost as the third person. You will be anxious to know what this doctrine of Trinity is. How do the Christians explain it? You would be surprised to know that neither we nor the Christian scholars have uncovered this secret till today. According to them, this is a Divine secret which

should be believed without questioning. When the Christians try to explain Trinity, they use a language and a style which defy understanding.

Some Christian scholars have offered the following explanation of Trinity :

"Let us worship one God in Trinity and let us worship Trinity in Unity Let us not join the persons of the Trinity, let us not divide the essence, because the Father is one person, the son is one person and the Holy Ghost is one person. But the divinity of all the three persons is the same. Their might is equal, their greatness, the same. Father is uncreated, son is uncreated, the Holy Ghost is uncreated. The Father is infinite, the son is infinite and the Holy Ghost is infinite. Thus there are not three infinites, nor three uncreated beings and one infinite being. The Father is omnipotent, the son is omnipotent, the Holy Ghost is omnipotent But there are not three omnipotents but only one omnipotent. Similarly, the Father is God, the son is God, the Holy Ghost is God, but there are not three Gods. There is only one God. Similarly, the Father is Lord, the son is Lord, the Holy Ghost is Lord, but there are not three Lords. There is only one Lord, because, according to the Christian doctrine, it is our duty to recognise that every person of the Trinity is separate God and Lord, but we are forbidden to say that there are three Gods or three Lords. The Father is not made, neither created nor begotten

"The Holy Ghost is from Father and son, neither made, nor created, nor begotten. The Father is one, there are not three Fathers, the son is one, not

three sons. The Holy Ghost is one. There are not three Holy Ghosts. In this trinity, the three persons are not prior to one another, nor is one of them smaller than the other. All the three persons are equal from eternity."

This is the explanation of the doctrine which, according to the Christians, is the key to salvation. But what is the meaning of this puzzle, nobody knows. Recently the Pope of Rome tried to add one more person in the Trinity, namely Mary, the mother of Christ, but his was a voice in the wilderness.

Common sense cannot admit that three are equal to one, or one is equal to three. Even a child knows that two and two make four. Suppose, it appears written in the heavens that twice two are five. Even then the Christians, like other nations, will declare that this writing in the heavens is wrong. No logical argument can prove it right. Suppose the moon is shining before us and people are not tired of praising its brightness Just then another person comes and says that in his watch it is twelve o'clock noon. Even if this gentleman tries to convince us of the correctness of his watch and the expert skill of its manufacturers, we cannot deny the existence of the moon on the sky in spite of all his eloquence, because his claim clashes with an admitted truth and our own observation of facts. In the above creed, where it has been said that God in reality is three,

it has also been written that God, Christ and the Holy Ghost form one unity. Thus the thesis that one is three and three is one is so patently incorrect that no one can believe in it even for a minute. It is possible that our Christian friends may claim that this is something beyond reason and is one of those metaphysical realities which reason is unable to grasp. But we reply that this is not beyond reason but patently against reason. That which is beyond reason can be recognised as such because human reason is limited, but that which is clearly against reason cannot be admitted. If someone says that one rupee of Pakistani currency consists of eight two-anna pieces, four four-anna pieces and two eight-anna pieces or 100 paisas, this can be admitted, but who can admit that one rupee is equal to three rupees of the same value and the same weight.

In this connection the Christian priests usually argue from a triangle. They say that a triangle has three sides, but it is all the same one. If such arguments are put forward, we can draw the figures of a square and say that, although it has four sides, it is all the same one. Thus four become one. This is like a house with a hundred rooms. If a Christian priest looks at this house, he may claim that hundred is equal to one. The question is whether reason is prepared to admit such conclusions. The human

body consists of a bodily frame, a spirit and a psyche. Is man no more than a spirit or a mere body or a mere psyche? The Christian God also consists of three elements, the Father, the son and the Holy Ghost. Is it not a fact that every compound needs certain elements? Does God also stand in need of something? Can every separate element of this compound claim the status of divinity? Then there is also the question: Is there a compound which is a compound and yet not originated? Is God also originated? If there is no life, the body is mere clay. If there is no body, the spirit cannot perform those functions for which the body is necessary. Is this true also of God?

The Gospels and the Trinity

In our opinion, the existing Gospels also furnish no proof of the doctrine of Trinity. The Gospels prove conclusively that Christ was created. At the most confusion is created by the words, Father and son. We have already shown above that these words have not been used in a literal sense but only in a metaphorical sense. To prove our thesis, we shall take you to the Gospels for a time.

1. In the beginning of his Gospel, Matthew says:

"The book of the generation of Jesus Christ, the son of David, the son of Abraham" (i, 1).

It ends with these words:

"And Jacob begat Joseph, the husband of Mary, of whom was born Jesus, who is called Christ" (i, 16).

The question arises, how can he be God who has ancestors and whose genealogy can be traced? How can he be uncreated who is born of a woman? If some book says about a person that he was born, and then it claims that the person born is uncreated, we cannot accept its verdict. If a voice comes from the heaven to support this contradiction, we will say that it is not a Divine voice.

2 Matthew (i, 20) also says that the angel said to Joseph:

"Fear not to take unto thee Mary thy wife: for that which is conceived in her is of the Holy Ghost."

Mary is not yet a wife. She is only betrothed to Joseph In her womb is Christ, whose existence depends on the power, and the power is from the Holy Ghost. This proves that the Holy Ghost is powerful, but it does not prove that Christ is powerful

3 Matthew also says that the Magians came to see Christ thinking that the king of Jews was born. In the first place, it is wrong that Christ was the king of Jews Secondly, consider the words, Christ was born. How can one in his senses believe that a

person who was born of a woman was God?

4. Matthew (ii, 13) further says:

> "The angel of the Lord appeareth to Joseph in a dream, saying, Arise, and take the young child and his mother, and flee into Egypt, . . for Herod will seek the young child to destroy him."

If the Gospels claim that the might of Jesus Christ was equal to the might of God, where was the need to flee to Egypt with the child? Does the might of God also run away before the enemies?

5. Matthew (iv, 5-8) says:

> "Then the devil taketh him into the holy city, and setteth him on a pinnacle of the temple, and saith unto him, If thou be the Son of God, cast thyself down. . . . Again, the devil taketh him up into an exceeding high mountain, and sheweth him all the kingdoms of the world, and the glory of them."

6. Matthew (v, 9) says:

> "Blessed are the peacemakers: for they shall be called the children of God."

Undoubtedly, those who are at present trying to prevent a third world war can be called, according to Matthew, the children of God, but Christ whom the Christians call the only son of God says in the tenth chapter (verse 34) the same Matthew:

> "Think not that I am come to send peace on earth: I came not to send peace, but a sword."

Thus, according to Christ, the children of God

are those who come to make peace and he who does not come to make peace is not the son of God. If after this the Gospels claim that Christ is the son of God, we will be forced to say that the words attributed to Christ are totally wrong.

7. Matthew (xxiii, 8-10) says:

"But be not ye called Rabbi: for one is your Master, *even* Christ; and all ye are brethren. And call no *man* your father . . .; for one is your Father, which is in heaven Neither be ye called masters: for one is your master, *even* Christ."

It is clear that here the words father and brethren have been used in a metaphorical sense. This also proves that the spiritual father is only one, that is, God. Christ is not the spiritual father or God, but master and guide.

8. Mark (ii, 3-5) says :

"And they come unto him, bringing one sick of palsy, which was borne of four. . . . When Jesus saw their faith, he said unto the sick of the palsy, Son, thy sins be forgiven thee."

It is clear that this man suffering from palsy was not descended from Christ. He used the word "son" for him out of love. Similarly, wherever the words "son of God" have been used for Christ, it is in a metaphorical sense, and these have been used to express the sentiment of love for him.

9. Mark (x, 8) says that Christ said :

"And they twain shall be one flesh ; so then they are no more twain, but one flesh."

The question is whether both husband and wife are one flesh. Is it that here also two is equal to one and one is equal to two? Or can it be said that husband is wife and wife is husband ? The real fact is that all this is a poetic and metaphorical way of expression. They should not be taken literally. If a Gospel uses such forms of expression, it is sheer misunderstanding to quote any of its expressions to prove that Christ, God and the Holy Ghost are one.

10. In the same chapter (verses 17-18) Mark says :

"And when he was gone forth into the way, there came one running, and kneeled to him, and asked him, Good Master, what shall I do that I inherit eternal life ? And Jesus said unto him, Why callest thou me good ? *there is* none good but one, *that is*, God."

Can Christ be the equal of God in divinity and goodness, when he had spoken the above words ?

11. In the thirteenth chapter (verse 31-32) of Mark, Christ says :

"Heaven and earth shall pass away: but my words shall not pass away. But of that day and *that* hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels which are in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father."

It is clear that Christ is not putting forth this claim in an ordinary way but in all his glory. He

says that no angel and no virtuous man knows about the Day of Judgment. Even he does not know about it who is called the Son of God. After these clear and precise words, who can claim that, in respect of knowledge, the Holy Ghost and Jesus can equal God ?

12. We also draw attention to the fourteenth chapter of the Gospel of John (verse 12) in which it is said that Christ gave the good tidings to his disciples :

"Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that believeth on me, the works that I do shall he do also ; and greater *works* than these shall he do."

We cannot admit that the disciples of Jesus and those who believe in him can do greater works than he. But here we want to prove that if Christ had been God, he would not have spoken the words that "you shall do greater works than I," because no one can do greater works than God.

13. John says in chapter 10 (verses 34-35):

"Jesus answered them, Is it not written in your law, I said, Ye are gods? If he called them gods, unto whom the word of God came, and the scripture cannot be broken."

This means that Christ and the scripture are agreed that those to whom the word of God came shall be called God. It is clear from this that those to whom the words of God came were not God in

the true sense of the word. They have been called God in a metaphorical sense. This shows that if the word "God" has been used for Christ in the Gospels in some places, it is not of much significance.

14. John says in his eighth chapter (verses 41-42):

"Then said they to him, We be not born of fornication; we have one father, *even* God. Jesus said unto them, If God were your Father, ye would love me."

These words show that the elders of the Jews had put forth two claims. Firstly, "we are not born of fornication"; secondly, "our father is God" According to them, no man born of fornication could be the son of God. Moreover, they said that God was their father. Christ contradicted their claims and put forward the argument that since they did not love him, they could not be sons of God. Only that man can be the son of God, according to the Gospel, who did works like those of God. For example, God loved Christ; he should also love Christ. These elucidations make it clear that the word "son" has not heen used here in the physical, material and racial sense. It has been used in a metaphorical sense. If someone still doubts this truth, we quote below the words of Christ himself.

15. In the same chapter of John (verse 39), Christ says:

"If ye were Abraham's children, ye would do the

works of Abraham."

Here a general rule has been laid down, namely, he who does the works of Abraham deserves to be called the son of Abraham. This again shows that the word "son" or "child" or "children" has been used here not in a literal but in a metaphorical sense, as if it is a normal mode of expression of the Bible that it calls all those who do good works the children of God. Thus both, according to the Old and New Testaments, God has innumerable children, and of these, he who does some outstanding work is called the only son of God.

So far we have tried to prove from the Gospels that the doctrine of Trinity is baseless. Now we shall prove our thesis from the Old Testament.

Before this we have quoted in this book the words of Christ that not a word of Torah can be changed or cancelled. It is a book founded on truth. But we are surprised to learn that the followers of Torah, the Jews, have not found in their book any trace of Trinity, although this book has been confirmed by Christ. According to the Jews, belief in Trinity is an open blasphemy. In our opinion, no Christian can dare claim that the Christians have a better knowledge of Hebrew than the Jews. As far as the Jews are concerned, they do not consider as reliable the translation of Torah by the Christians.

The Christian world, in spite of the support it has given to the Jews in Palestine, has not been able to bring them any nearer in this respect. Perhaps very few people know that Israel has put a more severe ban on the teaching of the Gospels than a similar ban in Communist countries. The Jews are strongly opposed to the doctrine of Trinity, because of the clear teachings of the Torah. We have quoted many references from the Torah in the first chapter to prove that the teachings of this book do not warrant the belief in Trinity. Jesus Christ had not come to teach that the Torah is false or that it stands cancelled. He had come to confirm the teachings of the Torah. Here we shall quote one example :

Deuteronomy (vi, 4) says : "Hear, O Israel : The Lord our God *is* one Lord."

In the Hebrew version, the word *Ahad* has been used for one. Christ has repeated this dictum of the Torah in the following words :

"Hear, O Israel ; The Lord our God is one Lord: and thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart" (Mark, xii, 29-30).

In the Arabic version of the New Testament the word *Wahid* has been used for the Urdu word *Aik* (one). Now the question arises as to how the Arabic *Wahid* (one), the Hebrew *Ahad* (one) and the Urdu *Aik Akaila* (only one) can bear the meaning of Trinity.

Far-Fetched Interpretations

In the above pages we have shown by quoting many references that Christ is not God. He is the son of Mary descended from David and Adam. He is not part of God. He is the exalted servant of God. When our Christian friends are unable to rebut these conclusive arguments, they are forced to interpret these references in their own way and put a construction on these clear words which is extremely vague and far-fetched. In their place, they bring forward quotations and references whose meaning they stretch to suit their own interpretations. It is not possible to mention all these quotations and references which will waste the time of the readers. Here we quote one reference. The Gospel of John (i, 1-3) begins by saying:

"In the beginning was the Word and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. The same was in the beginning with God. All things were made by him; and without him was not any thing made that was made."

The scholars of Trinity claim that here "Word" means Jesus Christ and He is God. If you put them the question: What Divine revelation has led you to this conclusion? they will say: Be silent, do not argue about God's words. We cannot understand this properly, for it is a Divine mystery.[2] We say

2. *Christian Teachings*, p. 10.

that if they take "word" to be equivalent to God, then the sentence "in the beginning was the Word" would mean "in the beginning was God". Then the sentence "the Word was God" would mean "God was with God". This would mean "God was God," and it was in the beginning with God and all things were made by God.

If our Christian friends do not agree with this, we shall, for a while, agree with their interpretation, i.e. "in the beginning was the Word" means in the beginning was Christ. But how does this go to prove the truth of Trinity? The words only prove that there were two Gods, one God and the other Christ But, where is the third God, "the Holy Ghost"? The Christians believe in Trinity but not in duality. We wish the Christian scholars take into consideration the difference between the knowledge of God and that of man. Man proceeds from the particular to the general. He uses induction, and induction has been defined as the attempt to sift the particular details in order to arrive at a general conclusion. So long as man is man, he cannot use induction in full. This is the reason why none of his decisions is final. There are defects and contradictions in his thinking. But God is free from all these weaknesses. His decisions rest neither on induction nor on deduction. Therefore, His knowledge is free from contradictions. Either you admit in the light

of these references that it is impossible to bring forward any proof of Trinity from the Gospels or you declare that contradictions and defects can exist in God's knowledge, but do not try to cast plain passages into philosophical moulds.

The Christians have made their three Gods responsible for the following duties:

(*a*) The Father creates and sustains the world.

(*b*) The son ensures salvation and atones for the sins of man.

(*c*) The Holy Ghost prepares the human mind for faith and maintains the believer in the state of faith.

Once we have a look at this division of work, innumerable questions crop in our minds up. Is it impossible for the Father or God to do the work trusted to the Holy Ghost? He who created the world and everything in it can also prepare the mind of man for having faith in Him. Then the question arises whether the Holy Ghost is a created being. If so, who is the creator of the Holy Ghost? Again, if God is Christ, how can they be two? Does the son himself provide salvation or is he the means to salvation? What about those born before him? Does he bring salvation to them also? Did he bring salvation to men after he had atoned for their sins? If so, how can he bring salvation to those who have gone before him? Again, atonement raises the questions:

Why should Christ suffer punishment for the sins committed by others? Is not every man responsible for his deeds? It is not possible for any man to count the number of sinners from the days of Adam up to now. What will be the number of their sin? But a few moments of crucifixion have atoned for all those sins Why? Is this atonement a cover for the past sins of the believers in Christ, or is it an atonement for all their sins, past and future? If it is an atonement for their past sins, then it was not necessary for the son of God to undergo this sacrifice, for the door of repentance is open to every sinner in all religions. If it is an atonement for the future sins of the believers, this is something unheard of because, before a sin is committed, how can it be forgiven? Does this mean that there is no need to put into practice the teachings of Christ?

In Genesis (iii, 16-20), it is said that when Adam and Eve disobeyed the Commands of God in the garden:

"Unto the woman he said, I will greatly multiply thy sorrow and thy conception; in sorrow thou shalt bring forth children; and thy desire *shall be* to thy husband, and he shall rule over thee. And unto Adam he said, Because thou hast hearkened unto the voice of thy wife, and hast eaten of the tree, of which I commanded thee, saying, Thou shalt not eat of it: cursed *is* the ground for thy sake; in sorrow shalt thou eat *of* it all the days of thy life;

thorns also and thistles shall it bring forth to thee; and thou shalt eat the herb of the field. In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread."

This passage shows that woman was punished with the pain of conception and man was punished with having to earn his bread by the sweat of his brow for the first sin committed by them. But the question arises: Why, after the atonement of their sins by Jesus Christ, is this punishment still being meted out to men and women? Do not the Christian women who believe in Christ suffer from the pain of conception and do not the Christian males have to earn their bread by the sweat of their brow?

If the creatureliness of Jesus can go together with his divinity, cannot the divinity of God be mixed up with the creatureliness of Christ? The body is limited, divinity is unlimited. When divinity was incarnated in the body of Jesus, did it become limited or remained unlimited?

Did the womb which contained Jesus also contain divinity and the Holy Ghost? When Christ became a son, can it be said that Christ is also the son, God is also the son, the Holy Ghost is also the son? If God was not with Jesus Christ in the womb of Mary, how can it be said that God became incarnate in Christ?

If Christ sacrificed his life to atone for the sins of humanity, God also must have sacrified Himself,

because it was God Who incarnated Himself in Christ. Jesus Christ used to worship God. If he was God incarnate, whom did he worship?

If Trinity is accepted and true and one also believes in the division of work suggested for the three persons, these and other innumerable questions crop up. If you ask the Christians to solve these tangles, they will be unable to do so and will reply to you saying: There are three persons in God: Father, Son and the Holy Ghost. God is the first person of the Holy Trinity who stands at the beginning of the Son and the Holy Ghost. All these three persons are equal There is no difference among them Therefore, all the three are worthy of equal respect. Jesus Christ was a true God and a true man. Mary was the mother of God in the truest sense of the word. The Father is called power, not because He is more powerful, but because, in the sacred Gospels, power has been ascribed to God, wisdom has been ascribed to the Son and holiness has been ascribed to the Holy Ghost.

In this respect, we quote below a statement of a Christian theologian, Rev. Charles Anderson Scott. He says:

"The first three Gospels, Matthew, Mark and Luke, do not contain anything which may give rise to the idea that the writers of these Gospels thought of Jesus as God. In their eyes he was a man who

had been specially graced by the spirit of God, and who had an unbroken relationship with God, so that if he is called the son of God, there is every justification for this. Matthew mentions him as the son of a carpenter and says in one place that Peter rebuked him after he had accepted him as Christ (Matthew, xvi, 22).

"In Luke we see that, after crucifixion, two disciples of Jesus spoke of him as a mighty prophet and word before God all the people (Luke, xxiv, 19).

"It is a matter which deserves special attention that, although the Christians had begun generally to use the word 'Lord' for Jesus before Mark wrote his Gospel, but neither in Matthew nor in Mark this word has been used for Jesus. The three Gospels mention the temptation of Jesus with special emphasis, but excepting the passage in Mark (Mark, x, 45) which refers to Jesus having ransomed his life, these books do not interpret the event in which it was interpreted later. There is not the slightest indication in these books that the death of Jesus had any relation to man's sin or his atonement.

"That Jesus presents himself as a prophet is apparent from many passage of the Gospels. For example, 'Nevertheless, I must walk today and tomorrow and the day following, for it cannot be that a prophet perish out of Jerusalem' (Luke, xiii, 33).

"He often mentions himself as the son of man. He never speaks of himself as the son of God. When his contemporaries use this word for him, probably they mean no more than that he is the annointed of

God. Nevertheless he speaks of himself as the son. Moreover, in describing his relationship with God, he uses the word 'father'. But he does not consider that he is alone in this relationship In the initial stages he treats other men as his companions in this intimate relationship But later experience and a deep study of human nature forces him to the conclusion that he is alone in this relationship with God.

"Peter's words on the occasion of the festival of Pentecost 'a man who was from God' present Jesus as his contemporaries knew and understood him. The Gospels show us that Jesus passed the various stages of his life from childhood to youth in the most natural way He felt hunger and thirst. He was tired and he slept. He sometimes fell into wonder. He suffered and died. Not only he did not claim to be All-Seeing and All-Hearing, he even denied that he possessed these attributes. In fact, if the claim is made that he was omnipresent, such a claim would run against the whole concept of him derived from Gospels. Not only this, this claim does not fit in with the story of his temptation, unless it is held that the temptation was not real. It must be recognised that when Christ passed through these conditions, he suffered from the ordinary limitations of human knowledge, and if there was any exception to these limitations, it was due to his prophetic insight. Then there is even less evidence in the Gospels that he was all-powerful or a supreme power. There is not the slightest hint that he did anything independently of God or claimed an autonomous role. On the contrary, his repeated prayers to God show that he relied on God in everything. This, in

fact, furnishes evidence that the Gospels are historically reliable, although these writings had not been completed before the time when the Christian Church began to believe in the divinity of Jesus Christ. Even so, evidence is preserved in these books, on the one hand, of Christ being a human being and, on the other hand, there is no evidence in them that Christ thought of himself as God."[3]

Rev. George William Knox, writing about the fundamental tenets of the Christian Church says in the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*:

"Thus the material (of the doctrine of Trinity) is Jewish, though already doubtlessly modified by Greek influence: but the problem is Greek; it is not primarilv ethical or even religious, but it is metaphorical. What is the ontological relationship between the three factors? The answer of the church is given in the Nicene formula which is characteristically Greek."

Another article in the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, "Church History," says:

"The recognition of Christ as the incarnation of Logos was practically universal before the close of the third century, but his deity was still widely denied and the Arian controversy which distracted the Church of the 4th century concerned the latter question. At the Council of Nicaea in 325, the deity of Christ received official sanction and was given formulation in the original Nicene Creed. The assertion of the deity of the son incarnate in

3 *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, XIV Edn., on Jesus Christ.

Christ raised another problem which constituted the subject of dispute in the Christological controversies of the 4th and following centuries What is the relation of the divine and human natures in Christ? At the Council of Chalcedon in 451 it was declared that in the person of Christ are united two complete natures, divine and human, which retain after the union all their properties unchanged This was supplemented by the third Council of Constantinople in 680 by the statement that each of the natures contains a will, so that Christ possesses two wills. Meanwhile in the western church the subject of sin and grace and the relation of divine and human activity in Salvation, received special attention and finally in the Council of Orange in 529 the theory was adopted that every man as the result of the Fall is in such a condition that he can take no steps in the direction of Salvation until he has been renewed by the divine grace given in baptism and that he cannot continue in the good thus begun except by the constant assistance of that grace which is mediated only by the Catholic Church."

These statements of the Christian scholars show clearly that in the beginning they were misled by the excessive love of and devotion to Christ. This excess led them to use words like the "Lord" and "son of God" for Christ. Divine attributes were ascribed to him and the doctrine of atonement was invented, although in the teachings of Christ there was not the slightest place for these beliefs. When the Christians were influenced by Greek philosophy,

they did not try to correct their earlier misbeliefs but went on to provide rational justification for the errors of their earlier religious leadership and, without addressing themselves to the real teachings of Christ, invented one doctrine after another.

Chapter 9

CONCLUSION

In the previous chapters we have impartially outlined the main features of Christianity. After going through these chapters, every impartial reader will agree with us that this sort of religion cannot be acceptable to any person with a rational mind. Those who are trying to preach this religion are not doing any service to the mind and heart of man. Instead, they are involving them in meaningless labyrinths and complexities. Their missionary efforts are opposed to the teachings of Bible itself. In the Old and New Testaments, God has been called the God of Israel, and Moses and Jesus have been mentioned as the Prophets of Israel. In neither book is there a single direction to preach this religion to outsiders on a worldwide scale. Thus, 1 Samuel (xxv, 32) says:

"Blessed *be* the Lord God of Israel, which sent thee this day to meet me."

1 Kings (i, 48) says:

"Blessed *be* the Lord God of Israel, which hath given *one* to sit on my throne this day, mine eyes even seeing *it*."

2 Chronicles (vi, 4) says:

"Blessed *be* the Lord God of Israel, who hath with his hands fulfilled *that* which he spake with his mouth to my father David."

Psalms (lxxii, 18) says:

"Blessed *be* the Lord God, the God of Israel, who only doeth wondrous things."

Christ sent his twelve disciples from the Israelites to twelve tribes of Israel for preaching his words, but he directed them in clear words:

"Go not into the way of the Gentiles, and into *any* city of the Samaritan enter ye not" (Matthew, x, 5).

Christ confined himself to preaching to Israelites. If any non-Israelite besought his mercy, according to the Gospels, he rebuked him sternly. Matthew (xv, 21-27) says:

"Then Jesus went thence, and departed into the coasts of Tyre and Sidon. And, behold, a woman of Canaan came out of the same coasts, and cried unto him, saying, Have mercy on me, O Lord, *thou* son of David; my daughter is grievously vexed with a devil. But he answered her not a word. And his disciples came and besought him, saying, Send her away; for she crieth after us. But he answered and said, I am not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel. Then came she and worshipped him, saying, Lord, help me. But he answered and said, It is not meet to take the children's bread, and to cast *it* to dogs."

These references show that, according to the Bible, Christianity or Judaism are merely national religions. It is forbidden to preach them to other nations. To establish a network of missionary institutions in different countries is opposed to the teachings of Christ. But it is a great tragedy that, in violation of these commands, the Christians are so much engrossed in preaching their religion that most often they ignore the requirements of justice. This is not legitimate missionary work. However, if a review is undertaken of the state of religion in the whole world, it will become clear like daylight that Christianity has met with total failure throughout the world. Now the missionaries of America, Britian and Italy and other countries are concentrating on Pakistan where their missionary efforts have been redoubled, because when other fields are closed to a man, he concentrates on those few fields which remain open to him and he bases all his expectations on those fields Everyone knows that, before 1917, Russia was a prominent centre of Christianity. But nowadays this country has fallen a prey to atheism and materialism. This centre of Communism and its allies are preaching day and night in other countries the doctrine that religion is an opium There never appeared on the stage of history any person like Christ. These communist territories are closed to Christianity and the institu-

tions whish had been preaching their faith in them have had to depart to other lands. The Cross has left Russia, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, Rumania, Bulgaria, Lithuania and Hungary. China which was some days ago the home of Christianity is now its burial ground. The Lamas have left Tibet. In Bharat the Christian missionaries are not allowed to baptise any Hindu. Goa was an ancient Christian temple. But now the Christians in Goa are struggling to safeguard their lives, honour and property. How can they propagate the word of Lord Jesus Christ in Goa, Daman and Dieu? Burma has declared that its official religion will be Buddhism. The Christian priests had made preliminary efforts to colonise it. But now they can be hardly permitted to convert the Buddhists.

In Africa, Christianity is losing ground in proportion as Western powers are leaving the continent. The blacks hate the whites When Christian powers were ruling the Continent, the churches were flourishing and the Christian priests were wielding great power. But when the government came into the hands of the coloured people, the religion which was supported by state power had to meet the doom it is now meeting. The church leaders are confessing with grief and sorrow that, in spite of spending billions of dollars on Arabs, they have not been able to convert any Muslim in the area extending

from Jerusalem (which is the city of the Lord and the capital of David's government) to the northern zones of Africa. This failure should have induced the Christians to limit the area and scope of their missionary activities, but they have learnt no lesson and made no change in their missionary posture.

THE END



Maulana Kausar Niazi was born on April 21, 1934. At 40, he is among the youngest members of the Cabinet where, for the last three years, he has been Minister first for Information and Broadcasting, Auqaf and Haj, and now for Religious Affairs, Auqaf and Haj. He speaks several languages, including Arabic, Persian, Urdu and English. His knowledge of Islamic theology is as unique as his acquaintance with the best in world literature, not necessarily religious. The practical thinker that emerges from the book uplifts the Maulana to the plane of one truly learned in the ways of Islam, whose "Fundamental Truths" are as right today as they were fourteen hundred years ago. These, supported by the sayings of the Holy Prophet, are applicable as much to the scientific twentieth century as they were to the nomadic tribes of Arabia when the Holy Quran was revealed. Indeed, ***Fundamental Truths*** is as much a study of Islam in depth, in the clearest terms possible, as it is a lesson in the application of these Truths to individual, communal and national requirements, anywhere, in any age. Maulana Niazi's facile style dispels the wrong notions about Islam, ignorantly entertained, or deliberately foisted, forcefully rebuts the falsehoods spread about it and proves the everlasting quality of the religion and its easy to understand and apply lessons, no less than it establishes the Eternity and Unity of God and the finality of Prophethood.

Maulana Niazi is essentially a man of the people, having risen from among them and serving them through the People's Government wisely stewarded by his leader, and that of the people, Zulfikar Ali Bhutto. Elected on Mr Bhutto's call in 1970 with an overwhelming majority, Maulana Niazi, then serving a term as a political prisoner, was later chosen to be a Cabinet Minister when Mr Bhutto became President. The Maulana's life is a story of vicissitudes, of fortitude in the face of misfortunes and of humanity towards his fellow beings. That most of it was spent in the company of the Common Man is not fortuitous. The Maulana would have liked it to be no different.